Building a 21st Century Trusted Workforce

With

Senator Mark Warner, Vice Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence
Susan Gordon, Principal Deputy Director of National Intelligence, Office of the Director of National Intelligence
Kevin Phillips, CEO and President, ManTech
Tish Long, Chairman, INSA (moderator)

October 30, 2018

National Security Institute at George Mason University

Henry Butler:	Good morning. My name is Henry Butler. I'm the dean of Antonin Scalia Law School. Welcome to George Mason University's Arlington Campus. It's a real pleasure to have you here and to welcome you for this conference that's co-hosted by our National Security Institute and the Intelligence and National Security Alliance.
Henry Butler:	This has been an incredible month for us at Scalia Law. We started it off with a fundraising dinner on October 3rd where we raised $1.4 million for the Marine McCarthy Scalia scholarship fund, which is our first need-based scholarship fund at the law school. That's a big step for us. The next day, we had five Supreme Court justices here as we unveiled a new statue of Justice Scalia. That's a pretty big thrill for our students to be in the same room with five Supreme Court justices, so that was great. This is kind of a book end of our month that's included a lot of other programs including last week.
Henry Butler:	We had a special seating of the Court of Appeals in Virginia here, which is another great opportunity for our students. We've also been hosting a number of programs over the last month, which has really been showcased a lot of the activities we have at the law school. We had a major conference on the economics of criminal justice reform where we had Attorney General Mark Herring speak to that group. We've also had a variety of programs where our centers are stretching out around the world. Our Global Anti-Trust Institute last week held a three day conference in Japan for Japanese regulators and judges dealing with competition policy. We're touching a lot of things.
Henry Butler:	My favorite conference of the past month, though, was one that the Boyden Gray Center for the Study of the Administrative State had. That conference was on the architecture of bureaucracy. The theme of it was to try to explain why government buildings are so ugly. But it's been a big week, and we've touched on a number of things.
Henry Butler:	Just a quick note about our law school and the way things are going here. We're currently ranked number 16 in the world according to the Shanghai rankings of world universities. I'd never heard of that ranking until a couple of years ago, but when they ranked us 16th I loved it.

Henry Butler:	But also a recent ranking came out and ranked our faculty number 19th in the country in terms of scholarly impact, based on the number of citations of our scholars. We're very proud of that. It reflects a long history of our school with a great commitment to law and economics research.
Henry Butler:	The university, one final bragging point about that, George Mason University is a Tier One Carnegie research university. To give you a sense of what that means, when we came on the list, we bumped off Dartmouth. That's a big step for our school. We'd love having outward facing programs like this. It's a real pleasure to welcome all of you.
Henry Butler:	I'm going to turn it over now to the director of our National Security program, Jamil Jaffer. Jamil has been an incredible leader as he's built this center very quickly. But most importantly for me, he has clerked twice for Neil Gorsuch, once on the 10th Circuit and then on the Supreme Court, and as a result of that Neil Gorsuch is now a faculty member her at our law school. Please give a warm welcome to Jamil Jaffer.
Jamil Jaffer:	Thank you all for coming. I realize that Chuck and I are all that stand between you and a U.S. Senator and a very distinguished panel, so I'll make it very quick. Welcome to the National Security Institute here at George Mason's Antonin Scalia Law School. We're a new start-up think tank inside the law school. About a year and a half old. Our goal is to bring real world solutions to difficult national security problems. We've assembled a great group of folks to do that, a great group of advisers, including Chuck and including [Tish 00:04:01].
Jamil Jaffer:	And a great group of visiting fellows from around the country. Lawyers, non-lawyers alike. We'd love to get you involved with the law school. We'd love to get you involved with the National Security Institute. There's materials outside if you're interested.
Jamil Jaffer:	But my real responsibility is to introduce Chuck Alsup who's been a great friend and a super mentor to me. Chuck is the President of INSA, the Intelligence and National Security Alliance. After a four decade long career in the federal government, serving our country around the world, including at the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, the Senate Arms Services Committee, and as a member of the U.S. Army for 28 years. Chuck Alsup, pleased to introduce.
Chuck Alsup:	I wasn't expecting that. Welcome, happy Thanksgiving Eve. I hope you've all got your costumes ready.
Tish:	Halloween.
Chuck Alsup:	Oh, yeah, Halloween. Sorry. Jamil got me shook up there. Thanks Jamil. Thanks to George Mason University for hosting us at this great facility here today. The university's National Security Institute is a thought leader on legal, geopolitical, defense and intelligence issues, and is always glad to partner with NSI. We look forward to future events together. Thanks to all of you for being here today. Hopefully we'll have a few more drift in here as we go along.
Chuck Alsup:	As many of you know INSA is a non-partisan association dedicated to promoting public-private collaboration on a variety of intelligence and national security issues. What Jamil said, we do too. And the partnership is natural for us to do things together. INSA recognizes the close

partnership between IC agencies and their industry colleagues, and we work to make sure that this cooperation is as effective and efficient as possible. We are always pleased to foster dialogue between industry executives and intelligence community leaders from both the executive and legislative branches. So we are pleased to convene this panel together for a robust exchange of views on the state of security clearance reform.

Chuck Alsup: We're quite fortunate to have some folks who are well-recognized leaders in this area. For me personally, we'll do a proper introduction here momentarily. For me personally, I want to say, thanks Senator Warner for being here with us today. Thanks for your leadership on this particular issue, and thanks for your leadership for our nation.

Chuck Alsup: Sue, as always, thanks for all you do, for all you do for the IC. For all you do for our nation. And Kevin, thanks for being the voice of industry. I think that many of you know, but some of you may not know, but Kevin kind of has pulled together 16 CEOs to be a voice of industry and really focus some attention on this critical issue. Thanks for all of you for being here today.

Chuck Alsup: With that, let me talk about a little bit how this panel's going to proceed. There may be a brief interruption in the middle of it because Sue has gotten an offer downtown that she can't refuse later this morning. She probably is going to quietly get up, but not before we ask her some hard questions. One of the things that I'm going to ask you is to make sure that one hard question you had for Sue, you get on your card, and you get it over to the aisle so we can make sure we ask that hard question before she leaves.

Chuck Alsup: With that, this is how we're going to proceed. We have about an hour and a half to talk with this distinguished panel. Tish is going to moderate a discussion that will go 45 minutes to an hour and then we'll get the audience questions. We're going to make sure we ask an audience question or two before Sue has to leave us. Then we'll keep going once that happens.

Chuck Alsup: When you entered the auditorium, hopefully you got some cards. If you didn't get some cards, raise your hand now, and we'll get some cards to you. Some three by five cards. If you do have questions, write it down. Pass it to the aisle, and someone from INSA or George Mason, one of our interns, will collect them.

Chuck Alsup: For those of you who got the coveted aisle seats, we just deputized you to help us in this process, to get things to run smoothly, so don't mess it up. When the card comes to you, just hold it up. Don't wave or stand up or anything. Just hold it up and one of our staff members will come by and get it. We'll get the questions up to Tish and as time allows we'll get those questions asked. If you need index cards, again, say so right now, so we don't disrupt this discussion later.

Chuck Alsup: One other constituency I need to mention. We had some supporters, some sponsors for today's event. They're the folks that make it possible to do things like this. Thomson Reuters Special Services, ManTech, the Chertoff Group, General Dynamics Information Technology, NSCIS. Join me for a round of applause for them.

Chuck Alsup:	With that, Thomson Reuters was our premier sponsor, and they asked that we have the legendary Charlie Allen from the Chertoff Group provide some brief remarks. I think most of you know Charlie. 47 years in the CIA, rose to its highest ranks. Four years as an undersecretary of Homeland Security. Importantly for this topic today, Charlie for about 10 years has been leading INSA's efforts on security clearance reform. He has doggedly kept focus on this issue. We all are thankful for Charlie for his stubbornness in making sure we get something done on this. With that, Charlie.
Charlie Allen:	Thank you very much, Chuck. Very honored to be here. One thing I was always evaluated back in CIA was, I was always incredibly tenacious on every issue. I think security clearance reform exemplifies the challenges. I really want to thank George Mason University and INSA for putting this together jointly. It's a tremendous opportunity, certainly with the panel that we have here.
Charlie Allen:	Security clearance reform, based on my years of working it, is just vital. It's vital that we be successful. It's vital that we have optimism about it because Sue Gordon has the optimize and the energy I think that exemplifies what's required. If we're going to do this in order to have a more secure nation, a more secure process for handling sensitive trust and security clearances for this country.
Charlie Allen:	These are simply my observations. We have become paralyzed by a commitment to almost zero risk. That's not just in security clearances but in a lot of other areas of intelligence and defense. We obviously will never have zero risk in what we do. We seem to have an inability to adapt to the changing environment, to the digital 21st century and what it brings in technology and the availability of data and how to use the data.
Charlie Allen:	Threats have evolved, information is easily available to us, but it is very fragile, it's very perishable. It moves on. Government cannot function effectively in the digital way. By the way we did security clearances in the 1980s and let me tell you the SF86 has not been modernized. Having just filled it out again, they've added another 30 questions to it, which I wonder, is there ever an end to the way we do SF86s
Charlie Allen:	The trusted workforce has three pillars. It has the government civilians, it has military personnel, and it has contractors. To solve this problem we have to have great collaboration with industry. There has to be that government-industry partnership truly. Kevin Phillips is here, runs ManTech. But he's taken apart himself to do so much to help make that partnership more believable and real. He's been a tower of strength and I'm just delighted that he's part of this group.
Charlie Allen:	Just speaking of Thomson Reuters Special Services, as a member of the Chertoff Group I've worked with Thomson Reuters Special Services. It's one of the great sponsor for this event, and we really appreciate what TRSS is doing in its expertise in technology, analytic support to the community as well as to law enforcement. It focuses on cybersecurity, insider threats, supply chain risks, which are very grave, terrorists and criminal networks and a host of other security threats. TRSS cannot hire the top talent it needs without changes in the way we do security processing.

Charlie Allen:	But you haven't come to listen to me. You've come here to listen to the panel. This is a superstar group of people. I'll now turn this discussion over to Tish, with whom I had the honor of working for many years. She is well-known, not only as head of NGA, but as a career intelligence professional who asks those hard penetrating questions. Over to you Tish.
Tish:	Thanks Charlie, very much. Thank you for that kind introduction, and thank you for all you have done for our nation and all that you continue to do. Thanks to everyone for being here today to discuss security clearance reform, a critical issue that we all know has significant implications for our nation's security.
Tish:	Unlike most national security issues that get discussed here on this stage, this topic is not a topic of geopolitics, but rather a debate over how to build and sustain a workforce that we can all trust to manage the sensitive business of government, which of course requires both security and the trust of the public.
Tish:	Nor is this topic an analysis of the threat posed by some foreign country. On this topic, we have met the enemy and it is us. It is us for not having modernized this process over time. Charlie talked about the SF86. Agencies have discussed this situation for a long time. I will tell you, I think not until recently has much work really been done.
Tish:	We're going to talk about all that's been done in the recent past. Efforts to modernize the clearance process involve three principal actors, as Charlie talked to, all of which are represented on the stage this morning. First, Congress. Congress creates the statutory framework and provides both the funding and legal authorities that enable executive branch agencies to recruit, manage and retain the government's trusted workforce. Just as critically, Congress also engages in continual oversight of the executive branch's work, ensuring that government efforts are effectively advancing national security and weighing in with new legislation that may be needed to improve performance.
Tish:	We are pleased to have with us here today, one of the leading proponents of strong Congressional oversight of the intelligence community, Senator Mark Warner of Virginia who serves as Vice Chair of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. Senator Warner will share his insights on the current clearance process and has view from the hill on measures that could make it more efficient and effective. In fact, some of those have just been included in the intelligence authorization bill that passed his committee and is now awaiting action on the Senate floor.
Tish:	Second, we have the executive branch. The executive branch implements the clearance process. Efforts are already being undertaken to make the existing process more efficiency. Centralized responsibility for investigations and adjudications at the Department of Defense, make greater use of electronic data and software tools that can both speed up the investigation and generate more comprehensive insights on personnel security, and implement a continuous evaluation process for individuals who are already part of the trusted workforce.
Tish:	The office of the DNI, as a security executive agent, issues the policies and standards that will guide changes to investigations and adjudications, as well as guide the implementation of a

continuous evaluation program. Principal Deputy DNI Sue Gordon is here with us this morning to tell us about the ODNI's perspective on the policies and procedures that are needed to bring the clearance process into the 21st Century. Sue's personal engagement is a sign that the ODNI is placing a great emphasis on the need to reform the clearance process, and I dare say to do it right.

Tish: Third, industry supports agencies throughout the intelligence community, the Department of Defense and other federal agencies conducting classified work. Cleared contractors make up a substantial portion of the trusted workforce. The firms that work in this space need a clearance process that functions efficiently so they can execute the tasks given to them by government agencies.

Tish: Kevin Phillips, the President and CEO of ManTech is a leading voice on the need for smart security clearance reform, and has led a coalition of 16 CEOs who have sought to focus awareness on this issue. Kevin will share private sector perspectives on the challenges and on the reform process that is underway.

Tish: Just a reminder that this event is on the record. INSA is recording the discussion. We will post the video later this week, and clearly the press is here as well. With that, let's finally get this discussion underway. Let me start with a question, a broad question for all three panelists. What does success look like, and how do we measure it? Senator Warner, would you like to kick off the conversation?

Sen. Warner: First of all, Tish, thank you and INSA for being willing to host this function. Thanks to George Mason one more time for always being willing to open its doors on so many issues that are important to all of us around the region, for that matter around the Commonwealth and the country.

Sen. Warner: This has been something that I've followed for some time, but it really was when Kevin and Bobbie Kilberg and the NVTS sat me down and we got into some of the details. I saw this constant problem had literally got to a crisis stage. When we talk about backlogs that are 740,000 plus, when we're thinking about young agents potentially joining the CIA waiting two years before they get cleared, or folks on the private sector waiting in limbo for huge periods of time, simply moving from one contract to another within a single JHS for example, we've got a problem,

Sen. Warner: I think even more immediately when we think about that, and we're talking about this mostly obviously in the context of DOD and VIC, but if we look at just the two tragedies of the last two weeks. The individual who tried to assassinate former presidents, vice-presidents, members of the media; or the horrific tragedy in the Synagogue in Pittsburgh, there's a role for cleared and secured workforce in law enforcement as well.

Sen. Warner: This is not simply a problem, it's as Dan Coats said, it is a crisis. At least from the intelligence community's standpoint, I think we've gone about trying to educate everyone, both how broken the process is and think about that answer, and I will get to it very briefly, on what success looks like.

Sen. Warner:	The best news I think we've got on taking this problem on is when Dan Coats acknowledged at ODNI that this was not just a problem but a crisis and needed not incremental but revolutionary change, and he put the best change agent, I would argue, inside the IC on the job, in terms of Sue's work, and her corresponding counterpart to a degree, Admiral Joe Kernan on the DOD side. I know she'll speak to that, but they are working in tandem, and I think we're finally starting to see progress.
Sen. Warner:	What does progress look like to me? It's really four or five items. One, clearly we've got to get that backlog down. 740, we're down to 660. That's great but not nearly good enough for the end of this year. We need to make sure that we've got active metrics on an ongoing basis where we measure at least on a quarterly basis, where we get agreed upon goals on how we're going to bring the backlog down.
Sen. Warner:	Secondly, we need to not have an aspirational goal, but we need to have a real goal for both the government and the contracting community, that 90% of all secret clearances ought to able to be done in 30 days, and Top Secret clearances ought to be able to be done in 90 days.
Sen. Warner:	In terms of process change, we need to really make sure that the notion that we all use in terms of our terminology of continuous evaluation doesn't just become a phrase but becomes a reality. A part of that will mean moving past the 1970's version of sending retired FBI agents to check college transcripts or criminal histories. Clearly there's a lot of information tools that we can use to bring that into the 21st Century.
Sen. Warner:	Finally, in many ways, particularly for our contracting community, we have to recognize very few people either on the governmental side or the contracting side are going to work in the same firm for 35 years. They're going to move around. They're going to move to different contracts. Even if we get that initial clearance down, unless we can do clearance reform with vigorous and real reciprocity, we're just pushing the rock up the hill, and the weight of it rolling downhill is just goin to overcome any of the progress we'd make.
Sen. Warner:	Get the numbers down. Hit that goal of 90% in 30 days and 60 days, respectively. Continuous evaluation. New technology tools and reciprocity. Those are going to be the things that I'm going to look at, and I can tell you at least from the intel committee's position, and sometimes our competition makes this a little bit easier, but we are absolutely bipartisan and unanimous in making this a high priority for the committee on a going forward basis.
Tish:	Senator Warner, I think you just set up the rest of the questions for this session here this morning, but before we get to those, Sue what does your definitely of success look like? And how do we measure that, how do we get there?
Sue Gordon:	Since I don't want to be accused of filibustering, you're going to take my gratitude and thanks for all the folks here. I think the Senator said it exceptionally well. My definitely of success is we hae the right person at the place in the right time, with the confidence that they are worthy of the trust the American people place in them when they give them access to this special information.

Sue Gordon:	And that has to happen at a rate that allows us to meet demands. The Senator has suggested several criteria that we can use as metrics of that progress. I think that they're all very good, but it really is about that. I was talking to someone about all the initiatives we have the intelligence community, on artificial community, and on data, and on private sector partnership. Someone commented to me that we have one called right trusted agile workforce, and if we got that right we wouldn't worry about any of the others. Because if you have the people in the place they need to do their jobs, the rest of it will be taken care of.
Sue Gordon:	Dan Coats is right, this is a crisis. The Senator is right, we should be focused on it. I'm devoted. There are a lot of issues from getting from here to there. There are issues of policy. There are issues of standards, and there are issues of implementation. Each have their own issue. But we have to have it be independent of whether you're a staff or whether you're a contractor, that you have the same access.
Sue Gordon:	We require, as a community this whole population to serve the American people. There are differences, but there cannot be differences in our ability to get the right people in the right jobs. Some of those right jobs are in the private sector and some of those right jobs are within the government. Our access to those people at the rate we need them has got to be equivalent.
Tish:	Very good. Kevin.
Kevin Phillips:	I'll filibuster for a minute. Some of my appreciations to you Senator Warner and the Senate Committee on Intelligence for all your leadership on this, as well as you Principal Deputy Director Gordon.
Sue Gordon:	Or Sue.
Kevin Phillips:	Sue. Yes, ma'am, Sue. Military man, I apologize. On your leadership as well. I know it's very important. Charlie, I'm going to send you a Christmas card. You say nicer things about me than my own mother does. I'm just saying, that's amazing. And INSA for your leadership on this as well.
Kevin Phillips:	Volume, velocity and security. The first two are big data terms. The people of this town. I'm going to use a big data term to say that volume, velocity and security have to be of equal weight in getting the talent to support national security. If we don't include all of those, we will not defend against the risks outside of our nation because we are focused on the risks inside of our own walls. They all have to come together.
Kevin Phillips:	If we collectively as a community holding people to positions of trust work towards that goal, we'll make this work. Within that, a single for every level of classification that exists, a single application, a single investigation, a single adjudication, so that the clearance follows the person. It's portable, it's reciprocal, it's automatically accepted, and exceptions are rare not normal. That's what we're looking for.
Tish:	Well said. Kevin you mentioned that risk word. Charlie talked about risk as well. One of the things that Charlie said is that we're always looking for zero risk. That's achievable, just not

attainable. Senator Warner, in your bill you are requesting the PAC, the committee that is overseeing this process, to report to Congress on a risk framework. Sue, have you started on this risk framework? I realize that the bill hasn't been signed yet, but we often get started before Congress.

Sue Gordon: We know what's coming. He isn't shy.

Tish: What does that risk framework look like? How do you develop it? You have agency directors. You have the security community. You've got cleared industry. How do you develop it and then how do you get all of them to buy into the process?

Sue Gordon: I would agree that we haven't gotten where we need to go yet in terms of outcome. But I think that there are some things that we're doing now, particular on the framework, that are going to be the foundation for this.

Sue Gordon: First thing is, is that it's not only a whole of government, it really is a whole of country effort that we have going on when you include industry. We have groups looking at what we call the enhanced security framework that will provide the standard from which investigative standards and adjudicative standards will follow, and all will be able to use the same, because if you think about how we group up, we grew up from small to big, from few to many, everyone looking at the same objective, and each developing their own version.

Sue Gordon: The foundation of the framework is to have a common set of understanding from which you can develop the standards. The elements are what are you trying to protect? What are the characteristics of a trusted person? Who are those trusted people? What is the information you need to look at in order to be able to establish that trust? What are the data sources that you go after in order to be able to do that?

Sue Gordon: The framework starts from that and then builds down into the standards. We have had so many tiers, so many levels, so many definitions of suitability and security, and the question is how do you bring those together to this notion of what are you protecting, what is a trusted person and then how to build standards that have to go back to that?

Sue Gordon: I believe by the end of this year that we will have that in place that we can promulgate, and then we can build that out as a community. That's the first step to how we're going to move forward is you have to get it so that everyone can use the same standards, and that they are understandable and common enough so that they can be applied regardless of what the acting agency is on those.

Tish: And is industry involved in the development of this?

Sue Gordon: They are.

Tish: Kevin, how are you looking at what is being developed? Is it different from the way industry approaches risk? Are you satisfied with where we are in the process? Oh by the way, we do have on the record, the end of the year we'll have this [crosstalk 00:32:10].

Kevin Phillips:	300,000? I'm kidding. Specific to this issue, there's a lot of work being done. When these get conveyed there's going to be a lot of a baseline of capability for us to all work around, move toward the same objective. I would say that industry specific to security clearance just doubles up the effort because we have to test the people before they even apply because it takes so long. We're literally having to do that when many cases, thinking about not necessarily the security side, but the fitness or suitability side, their standards we don't even know what they are or have any guess because we're not informed. We're not informed.
Kevin Phillips:	We're taking a lot of components and trying to bring them together to bring the right person into the right position, not always knowing what that is. Then, from a business risk standpoint we have to apply performance on the contract, ability of the talent, and the trustworthiness of the talent to meet national security needs or the customer needs. They have to come together holistically, which is why, frankly, this letter that happened last year from the CEOs was driven because that's a risk based communication. We can't meet the requirements without this issue being raised. All you have to do is look at that letter. That's a CEO risk based action.
Tish:	Exactly. Senator Warner, does this approach work for you? Do you think this is going to get to what the committee was looking for?
Sen. Warner:	I think it's good to go back to what Charlie said as well. This notion that you can ever get to a risk free environment. You're not going to get there. Frankly, missing out on good talent because folks don't want to wait a year or two years to get a security clearance poses a national sex risk as well. Part of what's I think incumbent upon Congress to do is yes, keep the pressure on the IC, DOD and contractors to mitigate as much risk as practical. But then not jump down their throats if a mistake is made.
Sen. Warner:	One of the things that we're trying to do from the committee's standpoint is meet with the PAC on a regular basis to keep the pressure on them. As we started this process, I think, DOD and IC were pretty good. I think OMB was a little bit slow to the table. I frankly think that DHS is still slow to the table. We've got to keep urging them forward, but they've got to set the framework. We're not going to mandate and legislation that basic framework. We're going to keep the pressure on Sue to make sure that we get to that end of the time frame.
Sue Gordon:	We will. It doesn't sound very exciting to say that you're going to have executive adjudicative standards. But if you think about what takes the time, it is someone who is deciding what risk they're going to take based on the person and the position on the security and the suitability. If that isn't defined in some standard lexicon, you can't then do what you're begging us to do which is to have metrics on people demonstrating that they have moved against those.
Sue Gordon:	It doesn't sound very exciting to have those, and yet the prospect that we have a community that includes both these communities, who are on eh threshold of being able to agree to those, that is a big deal.
Sue Gordon:	There is a second big deal coming, which is how do I work with all the organizations that have to implement those? That's when we have to deal with big data differently, we have to look at

modernization of our processes, and that will come too. I really do believe that common standards, common understanding of what that framework is is an important move.

Sen. Warner: Let me just add one quick thing here is that you've made mention of the fact, and I do think we will get the intel bill across the line, we've got a whole section on the bill that focuses on this issue. But a lot of the major components are already law in the NDAA. We've viewed this a dual process, and I think one of the things that Kevin's mentioned and Sue's mentioned is really important. It appears to me that what's evolved over the last couple of years has been everyone setting their own standards, and now we're trying to force them into some level of compatibility.

Sen. Warner: My hope is with this new basic framework of responsibility, you almost start with the presumption that everyone's in, and then if you have to carve out an exception to take the agency, one we've talked about in the past, that may need a higher level, then take them out rather ... but we start with the premise of everyone in the bucket in terms of common standards and reciprocity.

Sen. Warner: One of the things that Kevin's helped educate me on, and I think I'm going to need further education on is what can the private sector do to get, even before the process starts. How much can the government give over to the private sector to do on their own before this even starts with a governmental process?

Tish: We've had this discussion for a while now. In a little different angle, if you will, let's talk about continuous evaluation. A number of question from the audience having to do with continuous evaluation. Senator Warner, you mentioned that. That's one of your measures of success, when we can get to continuous evaluation.

Tish: Sue, what is it actually mean? Heres just a couple of things, as you think about the answer to this. Will the intelligence community accept continuous evaluation from DOD? Will the implementation of continuous evaluation eliminate for the need for periodic reinvestigations? Will the information using big data, will it be evaluated in big time? Will it provide more comprehensive insights?

Sue Gordon: Little time. We're hoping that big data will be evaluated in little time.

Tish: Did I say more time?

Sue Gordon: You did. [crosstalk 00:38:32] You said big time, and I thought, oh it's a trick question.

Tish: I meant real time. Will it speed up the security clearance process?

Sue Gordon: Let me see if I can take those answers in order. Continuous evaluation is the notion of having access to a fixed number of data streams that if you had access to then they would provide insight into the behaviors of the individuals that you care about. Right now, we have seven data streams. Credit law information that the ODNI has made available in 20 agencies that have

signed up to be a part of continuous evaluation, and 15 more that are working on MOUs to be able to do it.

Sue Gordon: It is in fact in play right now. That's good, right? Common standards, common service, all good stuff with the potential to be able to do it. Will it replace periodic investigation? It should. It should be able to get there. But there's still a gap we have to cross, which is people who do adjudications have got to be able to use the data, sense it in real time and then be able to make a decision such that they don't have to go back and do something. That is absolutely the goal. It should be able to replace it.

Sue Gordon: Think about what that does in terms of investigative resources that allow us to work off the people that have never had a clearance. The benefit of that.

Sue Gordon: If I have an issue that we have not yet solved, and that is those tools necessary in order to be able to use that data in real time to make a decision about those. Luckily we're working both with the ... and the Department of Defense as well as the intelligence community recognizes that artificial intelligence, machine learning, data analytics are the tools that we need on many fronts. We think this one is particularly well designed to be able to help that. But I have to work with the agencies that are the implementers to make sure that they have the resources in order to bring this to bear.

Sue Gordon: So the ODNI has two roles here, one is as security executive agent that sets the policies. The second is the leader of the intelligence community. Hopefully with my other PAC members, advocates for the rest of the government to be able to put the tools into play. We should be able to, but there's a gap there in terms of implementation that we still have to work on, Tish.

Tish: It sounds like industry can help with that.

Sue Gordon: Oh, big time.

Tish: So, Kevin, maybe two perspectives. How can you help? But also, what do you need to see datawise from the government to help implement continuous evaluation with the industry, and how does it help with your insider threat programs?

Kevin Phillips: We're going to run out of time on her time with that.

Sue Gordon: Keep going.

Tish: Take any part of that.

Kevin Phillips: Let's start with continuous evaluation. It would be very nice if all of the government agreed and everyone who has responsibility for the trusted workforce, meaning every company that who has trusted workforce in its ranks, knows what that common data set is so that we can all adhere to that. My hope is that my fear is that 10 years from now we have different ones that are another reason for crossovers and transfers to happen.

Kevin Phillips:	If there's not commonality now, there's only going to be extensions of time and [inaudible 00:42:18] later. It's a very important point in time to get that addressed.
Tish:	That gets back to those standards Sue was talking about.
Kevin Phillips:	Government wide standards for trust. Using election and analysis and AI for CE to do that. Industry then can use the same standards to define its trust and put into its insider threat. Without that and information sharing, the insider threat is hollow because we don't know what are employees were doing at a government facility.
Kevin Phillips:	If we're going to be co-responsible for people of trust, which we should be, we have to figure out how to do that together and make it uniformly applied and available to the entities that hold trustworthy individuals.
Sue Gordon:	Can I just jump in on that?
Tish:	If you would, and then I would like to ask Senator Warner-
Sue Gordon:	I'll do this in a tweet.
Sen. Warner:	That's not normally the best way to communicate.
Sue Gordon:	Okay, too soon.
Sen. Warner:	I know who you work for these days, [crosstalk 00:43:17].
Sue Gordon:	God, I lost my train of thought. But I will be gentle. We'll talk about information sharing between the government and the private sector, which is always sporty, but I think that you can really help with because that privacy thing is vexing and actually in statute. That's probably something to work to be able to do this sharing that we need. In another sense we have other information sharing we need to do even within our organizations. This is one of the things we're working on trusted workforce 2.0. I nee to get my HR processes and my security processes closer together, so that what I know about someone's person's performance and what I know about someone's security standing can come together.
Sue Gordon:	It's that same sort of thing that I think will allow us to have more confidence. The notion of bringing data sets together, bringing common knowledge together, sporty across government-industry barrier, but still needs to be done within the government so that we get the whole picture. The better your whole picture, the more likely you are to understand the risk you're assuming.
Tish:	You brought up the privacy piece which is what I wanted to ask Senator Warner about. We're talking about gathering a lot of data on a continuous basis on all of these people. Does this raise concerns and is Congress thinking about how we balance security and privacy?

Sen. Warner:	Taking it in that order, obviously we are thinking about security and privacy. As someone who's spent good bit of time learning and trying to think through what the guardrails ought to be on social media, there's an intersection point. I think most Americans probably don't realize that Facebook and Google know much more about each and every one of us than USG does.
Sen. Warner:	If these other tools are out there, how we think about their rights and responsibilities and the intersection with government is an area we need to think through. Also, if there are specific changes in law, we need to take on that challenge. I think on this subject at least, you would find very, very broad bipartisan support.
Sen. Warner:	Three other quick things that I think we have to do. I've spent time with both Sue and Kevin on this, which is that while we may not be able to mandate that, for example, universities have to share in a user friendly way college transcripts; or that local law enforcement have to share criminal records, we sure has heck can set incentives in place that say if you want federal resources, the amount of those or the ease of those may be increased if you share this information to help us make sure that we've got that trusted workforce, and we don't have to use one of the things that drove most of my members more crazy than anything, was the idea of sending a human being out to check out college transcripts or to back to a local jail and check somebody's criminal record. Makes no sense in an era where we've got different types of obviously much greater information sharing.
Sen. Warner:	Frankly, one of the things that we also have to do, and this is where we need to do some work and have to work with OPM and OMB, is to make sure that agencies in terms of their own budgeting process, don't put the security clearance part to the back of the line. That whether this becomes a line item in a budget that has to be reported on a regular basis, but that we make sure that we keep the resources flowing so you don't end up building up this back log that then becomes in and of itself a huge budget hurdle. It no longer becomes part of the built in base budget. It becomes a separate problem in and of itself.
Tish:	Sue, I'm mindful of the time.
Sue Gordon:	I do, I need to roll.
Tish:	Any last-
Sen. Warner:	Give her one more hard question. Give her a real hard question. [crosstalk 00:47:56].
Sue Gordon:	I know the hard questions. So I'm going to answer it. Number one is, there is no one more interested in solving the issues of reciprocity than the government side. The reason is, is because especially in a time of dynamism in terms of mission needs, the private sector is a huge provider of the talent we need. Agility and nimbleness cannot be accomplishment if we can't move.
Sue Gordon:	Reciprocity is huge. We didn't talk about that. It tends to go back to these standards.
Tish:	That was my question.

Sue Gordon:	It does tend to go back to these standards.
Tish:	Why does it take so long?
Sue Gordon:	Because everyone has a standards and who's taking the risk? It really does come back to we got to a common view of risk elements are so that we don't have the individual organizations-
Sen. Warner:	Before you get off, because I want you to just share, make some real news here, because I love you doing that. We've done a lot of work together.
Sue Gordon:	We have done a lot of work.
Sen. Warner:	If you have this goal, which I think was really great of having these common standards by the end of the year, could you give an aspirational goal that X percent of agencies involved recognizing there will be outliers. Is it safe to say that we'll hae 60%, 70% of DOD and IC with some level of reciprocity by end of first quarter next calendar year, by mid-year next year calendar year? Give us something we can shoot for.
Sue Gordon:	I don't ever want to lie to you, so I'm going to try and not sound hedgy and sound true.
Sen. Warner:	Now you're sounding like a politician.
Sue Gordon:	I believe we will have in this coming year agreed to standards that are promulgated in a policy document. I do.
Sen. Warner:	This fiscal year or this coming calendar year?
Sue Gordon:	I'm going to say fiscal year because [crosstalk 00:50:08]. Later I might have to go to calendar year. I believe we'll have those. What we have to get better at is the accountability for following the standards and then the understanding of why it is that they're not. I don't think we have a bunch of agencies that are dilettantes, I believe that everybody is trying to do the best job for the nation.
Sue Gordon:	But once we have the standards, then you have to work on accountability to find that they're met.
Tish:	Sue, we've talked about that. Obviously we all here want you to think about how you're going to enforce that across the agencies.
Sue Gordon:	It really does come down to, again, it's not willful disobedience. It is about this notion of convincing people that there is a different way that we can understand risk. That's the standard space. Give them some tools. We're already beginning with CE. Then make sure that within their own organizations, and again, intelligence community is not the big issue. There are a lot of agencies involved here who don't all have the resources that we do in order to make this happen. Even within the intelligence community that has the resources, to get the resources devoted to this new way of dealing with data, is the big move.

Sue Gordon:	But we have initiatives placed against that. So, you ought to expect the standards. You ought to expect us to be able to measure them, and then I'll give you a better view of when I can be confident that we have them in place. But reciprocity, real deal. But there is a gap between the people have to assume the risk and the tools they need in order to be confident in that risk. That's what we're trying to close.
Sue Gordon:	I'm grateful for your interest. This is a really important issue for all of us. Like I said, it just comes down to national security, and we're all kind of in favor of that. We're running the risk of not being able to use the talent that we know is existent if we don't solve this problem. I love both my country and solving problems. So the pressure these two pressure put on me is welcome, even if it is vexing. I appreciate your interests, let's keep the conversation going. I really do think we have it. And it's 600,000 not 660,000.
Sen. Warner:	It's 600,000. So we've gone from 740,000 to 660,000 to 600,000?
Sue Gordon:	I would think by the spring [crosstalk 00:52:29] with the help of the department that we'll be down maybe half that much by the spring.
Sen. Warner:	So we'll be at 300,000 by the spring. Take it from Sue Gordon right here.
Sue Gordon:	I hope so.
Sen. Warner:	And that means of course, most of those are on the DOD side of house. [crosstalk 00:52:46]
Sue Gordon:	Thank you all so much for being here. As always. Kevin. Thanks.
Tish:	The answer to everything is in here.
Sue Gordon:	Thank you all.
Tish:	Good luck with that PC.
Sen. Warner:	And if you can stop some of that tweetage going froward from your next meeting that would be great too.
Tish:	Okay. Still plenty to talk about. Let's talk about equal treatment for contractors, for our industry partners. Senator Warner, the bill that is awaiting the Senate floor includes a provision requiring consistent treatment of government and contractor employees. What led the committee to put that language in the bill?
Sen. Warner:	What led was the fact that as bad as the problem is on people who serve in the government, as frankly most of you know, it's even worse on the contractor side. The absurdity that we had in some of our public testimony, some of the notion that as you work from one contract to another, still within DHS, it's taking 120-150 days, that is not fair to the contactor. It's frankly not fair to the taxpayer, because you're not getting the value that you should be getting. Since this is going to be an ongoing public-private responsibility, and if we wanted to try to start with

everybody in the bucket and then carve out exemptions, as opposed to the other way around, which is everybody carves out their own space, and there's very little commonality. We thought we needed to go ahead and not just state this is policy but state it as law.

Tish: I thought you were going to say it's because of Kevin.

Sen. Warner: They were pretty convincing as well.

Tish: Kevin, how do you see this being manifested, and how do you see how the bill helping?

Kevin Phillips: First of all, the bill and the NDAA from last year that had additional language as well as the president's management agenda, there's a lot of movement to get this addressed.

Kevin Phillips: As a CEO and the CEO is working this, the assumption is, and we really believe this, that if you're going to contract something out it's because there's a critical need. I either need a ship, a plane, a satellite today. Or I need this critical information system, or I need a new software tool, and I need that developed to meet mission demand that is important to national security, and within that you hire people based on the inability of the government to get it. High demand resources. Or you hire them because there's a surge that is not permanent, say war operations.

Kevin Phillips: Everything we assume we receive as a contractor is important. When we come in and say we need a clearance or we need slots, just basic slots to get people cleared, and we can't get the slots or we can't get them prioritized on a mission need because they're not as important as other mission needs, then we're not able to meet the requirement. The desire is, can we be treated equally enough that if the government has to make a mission based decision on priority, do it that way, not on what color uniform they wear.

Tish: We are certainly interested in seeing this bill passed.

Sen. Warner: As a matter of fact, one of the things that I believe will get done, the issue is ... one outstanding issue, if perchance it were not to get done, we will take the Title Six of the bill the security clearance portions and run it as a separate bill. We need to make this the components of this legislation law. We've got pieces in the IC 18 authorization. We're going to go even further in the 19. We've really got the ... the committee again, I want to give Richard Burr credit, I want to give everybody on the committee credit. The committee recognizes how important this is to our national security, and unless we put this in the legislative language and put real measurable metrics, this will get talked about but the results will get pushed.

Sen. Warner: Again, Sue and I have worked together on a lot of issues over the year. I think we've really got someone who gets it, who brings a wealth of experience in Sue Gordon. I think Joe Kernan on the DOD side, where obviously a lot of the numbers are as well. We've got to make sure that NBIB, as it moves over to the DOD side, that that process move, that entity doesn't become an excuse for slowing this process down.

Tish: Well, Senator, I think we all know that which gets measured gets done. Having the bill pass even as a separate bill is probably music to everyone's ears here. How many legislative days are left,

and you want to wager a guess as to whether or not we're really going to see some legislation on this?

Sen. Warner: I feel there is not controversy about these changes. They were-

Tish: Bipartisan.

Sen. Warner: Bipartisan. Unanimously adopted. Obviously the House bill has got them in. Even with Congress's stellar record of getting things done, I'll put this in a much more likely than not category to get it done. I still hope it will be one in the IA itself.

Tish: We hope so too. There's a number of other very important provisions in there. We've mentioned clearance in person a little bit, could each of you talk about your clearance in person what that will bring to the community and perhaps what some of your concerns are about that? Just in case anyone is not up on clearance in person, it's the notion that someone's clearance is attached to themselves. It's much like a military rank. It's not linked to or dependent upon a particular position or contract. You take your clearance with you as you move. From my standpoint it would certainly enable moving between government and industry and back again. It's something that I've longed would be good. But I'd like to get your views.

Sen. Warner: This is a reflection of not only the changes that are going on in government and the private sector. This is the changing nature of work. There's going to be very few of us that are going to go work for the same company at the same basic position for 38 years the way my dad did.

Sen. Warner: What we need to bring to almost the whole notion work is the notion of portability. I've been spending a lot of time over the last three years trying to, big subject, but how do you make capitalism work for a broader group of people in American in the 21st Century? Part of that means, when we've got right now in America a third of our workforce is in some level of contingent work, either independent contractors, part-time work, gig workers, you name it. Yet we have no social safety net for those workers. I've been working a lot on portable benefits. The equivalent of portable benefits would be this notion of attaching your security clearance to you as a person and that allows you to move. Because many, again, of Kevin's workers are going to make that transition back and forth between government and the private sector. They're going to have a variety of contracts.

Sen. Warner: If we have reciprocity, common standards and continuous evaluation so that the individual is being continuously evaluated rather than we're going to review your background every five years whether you need so or not. I think we can make this a reality.

Sen. Warner: We may need, and this gets into a privacy area, we may need to look at more avenues of information about that individual, and I think a lot of that will go to the social media question in terms of folks willing to have access to that information. It's just as where the whole world is headed, not just a question of security clearances.

Tish: Kevin.

Kevin Phillips:	My view is, clearance in person and reciprocity. Reciprocity is the number one issue that CEO community had. It's a result of all the other indicators driving towards a lack of movement. Clearance in person addresses that. I was in the military. I was in the reserves, and when I got out of the reserves I went to the individual ready reserves for six years. There should be an equivalent of the individual ready reserves for people who've already been determined to be trustworthy, so that if they need to come back into the trusted workforce, and if they've been out not doing anything that would breach their trust because they haven't had access to data, they should be able to come back in. Because this is going to be a supply and demand gap for people with the capabilities we need for years to come.
Kevin Phillips:	We have to recognize that this is a talent gap. If we find a trusted individual, we should do everything we can to make sure that that trusted individual is available in the future and allow them a career opportunity wherever agency, government, contractor they can go. It's that simple, it's a hard thing to do because people are assuming a lack of trust. But if we don't do that, we just don't have the capability and the technology inside of the trusted workforce to do what we need to do as a nation.
Sen. Warner:	This just to drive Kevin's point home, and one of the reasons I think we have such a strong ally in Dan Coats is that Dan went from being a member of the Intelligence Committee, hearing everything, to where he then stopped being Senator January of 2017, was named ODNI Director and had a 30 to 60 period where he couldn't do any part of his job because he had to go through a completely, fresh, total security clearance process.
Sen. Warner:	He lived the absurdity of what we are talking about. How you go from being in the room on virtually everything other than Gang of Eight, to basically being viewed as NewCo employee number one. None of that transferring over was just absurd.
Tish:	Has anyone in the audience not had an issue with your security clearance? Okay, I think we're probably all fans of [crosstalk 01:04:37] clearance in person.
Kevin Phillips:	The [inaudible 01:04:39] industry, industry executives came together and did an estimate that 95% or more of the clearances in 2017 that were done were for existing cleared staff. Only 5% new.
Tish:	Is that because it is so hard to get through the process?
Kevin Phillips:	And we're repeating the process from every time you move from one contract to another, agency to agency. People repeat him, they look at it again. There's an assumption of distrust, not an assumption of trust. Therefore, you can't get any new in, and at the end of the day getting new talent in is the most important discussion industry wants to have.
Sen. Warner:	One of the metrics we had out of the agency, they were citing that 535 days before a new agent could actually be fully vetted and cleared before that young bright person could join the CIA. That is a national security problem, by not having attracting the best talent possible because people cannot, from a career choice and frankly even from an affordability choice, have that long delay.

Tish:	I think we all have many stories of young folks coming out of university who give up because they need a paycheck. Senator Warner you mentioned social media, and actually we mentioned it early here this morning. In 2017 the DNI, after consulting with Congress, issued a policy on the use of publicly available social media information such as any information on individual's social media that they haven't put the privacy controls on. It's out there, it's publicly available.
Tish:	The policy allowed all agencies to use that type of data in background investigations. But virtually none of our agencies have done that so far. The first part of this question, obviously, was for Sue, why not? What's lacking? Let's assume that someone is implementing it, the policy is out there to be implemented. Kevin, I'd like to hear from you on what industry is doing, and then Senator Warner I'd like to hear from you on what concerns do you have? And to what extent do you think that social media could be used in background investigations?
Kevin Phillips:	I'm going to start with what we'd hope something that's set as a directive becomes required versus desired by the agencies receiving it. So that industry knows the common standard, required versus desired, when the executive agent sends it out. So that we all know what the standard is that we have to meet to, and therefore we can adopt it inside of our company and utilize it.
Kevin Phillips:	There are 22 different agencies with 20 different adjudication processes, and they have different interpretations of the privacy act against people who have signed waivers for positions of trust. We have to bring that together, agree what that looks like so that industry and the agencies can more uniformly do that. My simple view is that we should be able to see everything if it's within the law, that those nations that pose a threat to the nation can for people who hold a position of trust. How do we get there and how do we know what that standard is so that we can not only get new talent in but get the bad talent out? Identify it and get it out.
Kevin Phillips:	That's just as important in this discussion as [inaudible 01:08:17] the trust that we need.
Tish:	Are you doing any social media monitoring today?
Kevin Phillips:	We do, absolutely.
Tish:	And do you do that before you hire, as part of your hiring process?
Kevin Phillips:	Whatever we think we can do within the legal framework to pre-vet a candidate, because it's so hard to get into the process, we do. That includes background investigations. That includes social media checks. Anything that we think within the laws that we can do, we do, because it takes so long. Putting somebody in the slot to get cleared is gold. We have to wait.
Sen. Warner:	I think this ... I wish Sue was here, because I think probably I would like to hear why so few agencies have used this tool just 'cause they're afraid to wade into it at this point in time. If there's one thing I think that we have seen for a long time we commended the enormous ability of social media to connect people. But I think we've seen over the last two years the dark underbelly of social media, and how it can be used to pit one another against each other. I think again, not to refer back to the tragedies of the last two weeks, the fact that people can go out

and find like-minded haters as easily as they can in today's internet world is something that I think we have to sort through.

Sen. Warner: I put out a white paper that had 20 ideas that laid out a menu of options that I think policy makers ought to be considering as we sort through what the rules ought to be on social media. Because one of the questions becomes not only what this individual posts, her or she, in their public persona, but do we have a right to know if this individual is creating fake identifies the way our adversaries did when they attacked us.

Sen. Warner: The Washington playbook is now out and being used by other nations as well to try to intervene. Do we have a right to know, just as individuals, one of the things I found pretty common agreement from, that we should have a right to know when we're contacted whether we're being contacted by a human being or a bot. There's nothing inherently with being contacted by a machine or by a bot, but should we have that right to be able to have that distinguishing characteristic? Should we have a geolocator, so that if somebody says they're Sue Gordon transmitting a message from McLean, Virginia, but it's originating in St. Petersburg, should that come up.

Sen. Warner: I think you're going to also see a whole movement, and California's done some of this already, you've got this whole privacy, but the flip side of privacy with GDPR is actually much more data transparency. One of the things I think would help educate all of us as we use social media, most Americans assume, "Oh this is great. Facebook, Google, Twitter. They're free." They're not free. All of these entities are sucking information, data points, out of us. I think we need much more transparency on what information these companies have on us. I think along with data transparency ought to come pricing transparency. If we knew that Tish's data was worth $18 a month to Facebook and Mark's data is worth $22 a month, that might create a whole new system between the user and the social media platform where people will come in and provide some protections.

Sen. Warner: I think Kevin ought to ... if your potential employees, if that information was available to the employees, I think it ought to be then available to employers as well. I think we need data portability. I used to be an old telcom guy. Some of you are old enough to remember in this room when it used to be hard to move from one telco to another. So we had number portability. If we have data portability, that might create new competitive pressures on some of the platforms that overly dominate.

Sen. Warner: I'm not saying every bit of this information needs to be made totally available. But if foreign adversaries can get access to all this information about your employees, within certain appropriate parameters, if they want to work for the government in a trusted position, whether it's on the governmental side or on the private sector side, the enterprise writ large ought to be able to have access to some of this information as well.

Tish: Well said. We probably have time for one, maybe two more questions. If you have any questions, please get them to the aisles. There are quite a few that are really for Sue. She did say she would answer questions, so we will get these to her, and then we will post them on INSA

website, I believe. I am reading them all, so if you have any more, please pass them to the aisles. A couple more here.

Tish: Senator Warner, you talked about this, but one from the audience. IRTPA required reciprocal recognition of clearances. Kevin, you've talked about reciprocity.

Sen. Warner: That was 2004, wasn't it?

Tish: That was 2004. So we have it in law. We also have it in DNI policy, and probably in DOD policy. If it's in law, Senator Warner, does that mean that maybe the law needs to be updated or perhaps, as the questioner asks, a step-up on oversight on what's happening?

Sen. Warner: I know that you're kind of still new to this process, and I don't want to break it to you, but just because it's in statute, doesn't necessarily mean it's done.

Tish: Trust me.

Sen. Warner: Because we absolutely believe ... when we were at 740,000 backlog. That's insane. I think the most powerful way that we can make this happen, not just in statute, but in reality, is once again, make these reforms that have already been in NDAA, but also in the IA.

Sen. Warner: Equally if not more important, is for me and Chairman Burr and the rest of our committee to just stay on the IC on absolute regular basis. Sue and I have gone through a variety of projects before. You recall some of our days in overhead.

Tish: Oh I recall those fondly.

Sen. Warner: There is an extraordinary important role for oversight here, to keep pushing. Not in the negative context. I think Sue and I think Joe Kernan on the DOD side, they want that ongoing attention from Congress because that allows them to keep pressure on both all of their respective agencies that fall within their purview, but also allows them to keep pressure as need be with our private sector partners.

Tish: Closing comments, thoughts? What's your biggest concern? What keeps you up at night? What's the easiest thing that could be done that would go a long way to getting your folks cleared? Kevin.

Kevin Phillips: Somehow, and I don't know how to do this, and this is the whole argument, how do we move from a position assuming no trust to assuming a position of trust when people are moving? How do we make sure as a community anybody who owns a trusted individual does everything they can to get the data to decide whether they're a risk to the nation?

Kevin Phillips: Those two back end issues fix the trust on the front end. Everything takes care of itself. But that's why the information sharing, those two things ... the whole assumption is we cannot get this addressed without awareness, but also recognizing we have to share information and share

the risk associated with the untrustworthy individuals and how to get them addressed [inaudible 01:17:03]. That's a big deal.

Tish: And essentially turn in on that.

Sen. Warner: One of the things that Kevin just mentioned there that's really important that we've not really brought up at this point is this information sharing, so if you spot bad indicators you can actually share that with the government or other folks. If we look at the insider threats from the contractor side, every one of the individuals that have come to light has had some prior history that should have been a red flag that should have been signaled to another contactor or signaled back to the government, so that individual was not continuing in that trusted position.

Sen. Warner: I think that's area that we've not spent as much time on, and I'm wide open for business if there's more things we need to do legislatively on that issue, number one.

Sen. Warner: Number two, we've talked a lot about DOD and the IC. I think they both got religion at this point. I think we need to stay on the PAC in terms of making sure this is government-wide. I think OMB has gotten better, but they were late to the dance in terms of recognizing that they've got a critical role in this.

Sen. Warner: I'm trying to be an equal opportunity offender here. I think DHS is still not got there, I'm not sure they fully acknowledge the extent of the problem. We need their oversight committees and, if not their committees, us to try to find the angle to get DHS at the table as well.

Sen. Warner: Then, whether it's Sue or Joe, you can have a bad month, but we can't have a bad quarter in terms of bringing these numbers down in terms of the current backlog, actually getting us towards this Secret in 30 days, Top Secret in 90 days. Boy oh boy, in glad Sue said it in front everybody here, making sure we get all those common requirements written out by the end of the year, and then holding y'all's feet and the various agencies feet to make sure there is that commonality by middle of next calendar year.

Sen. Warner: I think we've got to stay on that because my concern is without constant, we talk about continuous evaluation, without constant focus, and I know Kevin in industry will keep the focus, but without constant focus, my fear is that this is not the area that is prime on most agency head's agendas. We've got to keep it in their face in a positive way on an ongoing basis.

Tish: It's critical to the mission. As we have all said, as we said at the outset, as it has come clear through all of the discussion, it is absolutely critical to the success of the mission, if you will.

Tish: We didn't talk a whole lot about information sharing. It is in your bill, a required info sharing program with metrics. Senator Warner thanks to you and the committee for writing that into the bill.

Sen. Warner: And I've got both John and Mike from the committee here. If you have other ideas or suggestions, we are wide open for business on what we do in the next authorization bill on a

going forward basis. If we haven't hit all the high points and there's something we're missing, please, let us know.

Tish: Thank you, and really the audience thanks you, the community thanks you because we need this focus. This has been an issue for a long time. We clearly haven't been able to fix it ourselves all these years. Sometimes it takes that outside impetus to make it happen.

Tish: The numbers are coming down. NMBI is making really good progress in their business process reengineering. I know we are all looking forward to the executive order which will outline the transfer of NMBI to the Department of Defense. Hopefully over the next couple of months we will do another very similar discussion like this, and we'll add OMB as well as DOD to the stage. Senator Warner, we hope you will come back. Kevin, we know that you will continue to lead this charge for industry, and we thank you very much.

Kevin Phillips: Thank you.

Tish: A big thanks to everyone for being here.