2006 Current Fiscal Year Report: Joint Advisory Committee on Nuclear **Weapons Surety**

Report Run Date: 04/26/2024 04:52:12 PM

2. Fiscal Year 1. Department or Agency

Department of Defense 2006

3b. GSA 3. Committee or Subcommittee

Committee No.

Joint Advisory Committee on Nuclear

31 Weapons Surety

4. Is this New During 5. Current 6. Expected 7. Expected Fiscal Year? Charter Renewal Date **Term Date** No 09/04/2004 09/04/2006

8b. Specific 8a. Was Terminated During 8c. Actual **Termination** FiscalYear? Term Date Authority

Agency Yes 09/04/2006

Determination

9. Agency 10b. 10a. Legislation

Recommendation for Next Legislation Reg to Terminate? **FiscalYear** Pending?

Terminate No

11. Establishment Authority Agency Authority

12. Specific 13. 14

14c. Effective **Establishment** Commitee **Presidential?**

Authority Type Date

Secretary of Defense

09/13/1991 Continuing No Determination

15. Description of Committee National Policy Issue Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of Reports 1

16b. Report Date Report Title 10/05/2005 Classified

Number of Committee Reports Listed: 1

0 17b. Closed 1 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 1

Meetings and Dates

Purpose Start End A security review.

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 1

| Number of Committee | Current FY | |
|------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 40-(4) Damasas | Current F1 | Nextri |
| 18a(1). Personnel | Φ0.00 | Φ0.00 |
| Pmts to Non-Federal | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Members | | |
| 18a(2). Personnel | | |
| Pmts to Federal | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Members | | |
| 18a(3). Personnel | ድጋር <u>ሰርር ሰር</u> | \$20,000,00 |
| Pmts to Federal Staff | \$20,000.00 | \$20,000.00 |
| 18a(4). Personnel | | |
| Pmts to Non-Member | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Consultants | | |
| 18b(1). Travel and Per | | |
| Diem to Non-Federal | \$10,000.00 | \$15,000.00 |
| Members | | |
| 18b(2). Travel and Per | | |
| Diem to Federal | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Members | | |
| 18b(3). Travel and Per | ¢E 000 00 | የ ፍ ዕዕስ ዕዕ |
| Diem to Federal Staff | \$5,000.00 | \$5,000.00 |
| 18b(4). Travel and Per | | |
| Diem to Non-member | \$0.00 | \$0.00 |
| Consultants | | |
| 18c. Other(rents,user | | |
| charges, graphics, | \$65,000.00 | \$120,000.00 |
| printing, mail, etc.) | | |
| 18d. Total | \$100,000.003 | \$160,000.00 |
| 19. Federal Staff | 0.40 | 0.40 |
| Support Years (FTE) | 0.10 | 0.10 |
| | | |

20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The Committee reviews high-level national security issues to include a comprehensive look at nuclear weapons readiness and surety practices. The Committee communicates (via correspondence and conversation) with the

Secretary of Defense, Deputy Secretary of Defense, Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L), Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (NCB), the Administrator of NNSA, leadership at the DOE National Laboratories, and high-level DOE managers. The value of Committee advice is manifested in key US Government decisions which incorporate the Committee recommendations.

20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Members with former backgrounds and experience with DoD and DOE provide joint perspective; member composition - 3 DoD, 2 DOE, 2 DoE/DoD (all former high-level employees of either DoD, DOE, and/or both departments).

20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

The frequency of meetings average once every four to six months during the year. Nuclear safety, security, and control of the nation's stockpile remain an absolutely critical element of U.S. national security.

20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

Only source which meets the criteria set forth by the congresionally-mandated Drell Panel, which envisaged a high-level, nonpartisan committee to give expert advice on nuclear surety matters.

20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Closed meetings necessary to discuss highly classified information related to nuclear weapons security operations and design, in the interest of national security.

21. Remarks

One committee report was submitted during FY06, and that report is classified. Meeting minutes for all meetings are classified, but are retained according to the applicable guidelines. This committee is programmed to merge with the Defense Science Board.

Designated Federal Officer

John A. Fedrigo Defense Threat Reduction Agency

| Committee Members | Start | End | Occupation | Member Designation |
|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|---|
| Agnew, Harold | 05/20/1993 | 06/01/2006 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |
| Crawford, John | 09/04/2006 | 09/03/2007 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |
| Gold, Sydell | 03/25/1994 | 07/01/2006 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |
| Neary, Thomas | 09/15/2004 | 02/14/2007 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |
| Selden, Robert | 10/15/1994 | 10/02/2006 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |
| Welch, Larry | 09/01/1992 | 07/01/2007 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |
| Wertheim, Robert | 05/20/1993 | 06/01/2006 | Consultant | Special Government Employee (SGE) Member |

Number of Committee Members Listed: 7

Narrative Description

The Committee reviews high-level national security issues to include a comprehensive look at nuclear weapons readiness and

surety practices. The Committee communicates (via correspondence and conversation) with the Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (NCB), Under Secretary of Defense (AT&L), Deputy Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of NNSA, leadership at the DOE National Laboratories, and high-level DOE managers. The value of Committee advice is manifested in key US Government decisions which incorporate the Committee recommendations.

What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

| | Checked if | |
|--------------------------------------|------------|---|
| | Applies | |
| Improvements to health or safety | | |
| Trust in government | | ✓ |
| Major policy changes | | ✓ |
| Advance in scientific research | | |
| Effective grant making | | |
| Improved service delivery | | |
| Increased customer satisfaction | | |
| Implementation of laws or regulatory | | |
| requirements | | |
| Other | | ✓ |

Outcome Comments

The Committee's recommendations resulted in changes in Departmental guidance and policies.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

| | Checked if Applies |
|----------------------------|--------------------|
| None | |
| Unable to Determine | √ |
| Under \$100,000 | |
| \$100,000 - \$500,000 | |
| \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | |
| \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | |
| \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | |
| Over \$10,000,000 | |

| Cost Savings Other |
|---|
| Cost Savings Comments Committee members serve without compensation (except for travel reimbursement) and provide high-level, necessary reviews for two Departments, which otherwise would cost millions. |
| What is the approximate <u>Number</u> of recommendations produced by this committee or the life of the committee? |
| Number of Recommendations Comments The committee published their 2005 work in October 2006. Committee members briefed and discussed recommendations with senior leaders throughout 2006. No new recommendations were developed in 2006. Over the life of the committee, reports and recommendations have fluctuated as driven by need and topic. Average of 5-8 major recommendations per year beginning in 1991 |
| What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Fully</u> implemented by the agency? |
| % of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments Recommendations of this committee have been codified in DoD and DOE policy documents. |
| What is the approximate <u>Percentage</u> of these recommendations that have been or will be <u>Partially</u> implemented by the agency? |

% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comments

NA

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to implement recommendations or advice offered?

Yes No Not Applicable

Agency Feedback Comments

The Departments provide feedback via implementation plans, meetings, correspondence,

and conversations with Committee members.

| recommendation? | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| | Checked if Applies | |
| Reorganized Priorities | | |
| Reallocated resources | | |
| Issued new regulation | | |
| Proposed legislation | | |
| Approved grants or other payments | | |
| Other | ✓ | |
| Action Comments | | |
| The Departments have developed new guida | nce and procedures via departmental | |
| directives, manuals, and instructions. | | |
| Is the Committee engaged in the review of | applications for grants? | |
| No | | |
| Grant Review Comments | | |
| NA | | |
| How is access provided to the information | for the Committee's documentation? | |
| | Checked if Applies | |
| Contact DFO | ✓ | |
| Online Agency Web Site | | |
| Online Committee Web Site | | |
| Online GSA FACA Web Site | | |
| Publications | | |
| Other | ✓ | |

What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the committee's advice or

Access Comments

The Committee receives direct feedback from Department officials.