

## Transforming Interagency Information Workshop

**Workshop:** Four

**Date:** 14 April 2010

**Topic:** Interagency Collaboration

**Moderator:** CAPT David F. Sanders, JAGC, USN, Legal Counsel, OGMSA

**Panel Members:** Mr. Jean-Francois Orsini, CEO PIN-STRIFE, LLC

Mr. Steven Malphrus, Chief of Staff for Management, Federal Reserve Board

Mr. John Mittleman, MDA Engineering Liaison, Naval Research Laboratory

### Summary of Group Discussions Regarding the Following Questions:

1. Can a collaborative interagency effort produce an effective information sharing policy and dispute resolution procedure within the GMCOI?
2. What collaborative steps are necessary and what parties must be involved to institute the desired policy and procedure?
3. How should the policy and procedure be forwarded to an organization empowered to implement such a policy and procedure?

### **Group 1:**

#### **Question 1:**

Yes it can. Develop a collaboration performance table to rate information availability from various agencies. This would require the ability to report anonymously and identify the type of data.

#### **Question 2:**

Collaborative steps are as follows:

1. Identify a POC for each organization.
2. Establish mutually shared objectives/missions statement. Identify why the various organizations are sharing information. The concept must be sold to the prospective participants.
3. Create an MOA that will be signed by all participants.
4. Create a designated working group (i.e.: A policy adjudication working group.)

*Group 1 Question 2 cont:*

As it stands now a product/content is created for a given organization's customer base. There's no incentive to provide more than that. In fact, there's a disincentive, because it adds extra work.

Identify the benefits of sharing data. This requires a "big picture" view. With a great pool of information available through interagency collaboration, all parties will benefit from greater availability, increasing the quantity/quality of their information and decreasing the required time to hunt for it. When creating the steps it is suggested that the word "consolidate" is not used. This has a negative connotation and is often associated with job loss.

The agencies need to overcome the budgetary disincentive to collaborate. Government workers are not rewarded for saving money. "Everyone" is building their own networks and tools because they are funded for it. Whether they are duplicating efforts isn't of concern. If the money isn't spent the agencies are punished by having their allocated funding reduced the following year. The default policy should be to share everything and if not, justify why.

Data integrity may be an issue. Organizations may not want to share information because of the poor quality or lack of data. There needs to be an assurance of no negative repercussions for those who share in these circumstances. Sharing would bring the shortfalls to light and enable them to be rectified.

### **Question 3:**

The memorandum of agreement (MOA) signed among the organizations would be the binding agreement driving information sharing. The opinion of the group is that there needs to be buy-in from all parties involved. A mandate to share information has been in place for a while and barriers still exist. After the MOA is signed, a counsel could present it to the Cabinet level to give recognition and lend weight to it.

## **Group 2:**

### **Question 1:**

Yes, if the participants in the interagency effort are empowered to represent the leadership in their agencies. There will need to be strong top down guidance/demand for such a policy and a resolution procedure for an interagency effort. This effort already exists from several venues:

- The Office of the Director of National Intelligence issued Intelligence Community Directive 501 directing information sharing within the intelligence community. Several related documents have been published relating to implementation of this directive.

*Group 2 Question 1 cont:*

- The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 directed the establishment of the Information Sharing Environment (ISE) and required the President to designate a Program Manager with government wide authority to manage the ISE. The Office of the Program Manager for the Information Sharing Environment (PM ISE) has been established under the jurisdiction of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence. The PM ISE has already developed and documented a plan for dispute resolution.
- There is an Executive Office Interagency Policy Committee (IPC) called the Information Sharing and Access Policy IPC led by the Executive Officer Senior Director for Information Sharing Policy, Mr. Mike Resnick. This ISA IPC is the ideal office for providing top down guidance and information sharing across the GMCOI.

The draft Information Sharing Policy and Dispute Resolution Procedure created by the representatives working together will need to be staffed through all the agencies involved (presumably within the full GMCOI) for agreement before the final document can be disseminated. A plan should be implemented to deal with senior management that does not agree with agency representative's views. There needs to be strong top-down guidance to find consensus.

**Question 2:**

The following are the suggested steps:

1. Have an authoritative office provide strong top-down guidance to create the necessary interagency policy and procedure. The top-down guidance should provide specific scope boundaries for what the policy and procedures should address. It should specify all the agencies involved in execution of the policy and procedure. The top down guidance should specify a time line for completing the community approved policy and procedure. There should also be a time line for preparation of an initial plan and for implementing the policy and procedure.
2. Convene a working group of appropriately empowered representatives from the specified agencies/offices to draft recommended policies and procedures. Ideally the working group would be guided by a designated chairperson from the agency providing the top-down guidance.
3. Staff the draft policy and procedure through all the specified agencies for final approval before being signed by the office providing top-down guidance.

To accomplish the task representatives need to be empowered and there must be strong top-down guidance. (i.e.: IC501 top down guidance for information sharing.) There needs to be

*Group 2 Question 2 cont:*

specific scope boundaries of what the policies and procedures will cover as well as specifics on what is to be implemented.

**Question 3:**

If an empowered interagency process agrees upon a policy and procedure, the top level interagency body (IPC) should issue it to the agencies and departments as a directive. Alternatively the policy should be written in such a way that each implementing agency must sign the agreed upon policy indicating they will implement it. The agencies and departments should have already indicated their concurrence with the policy in Step 3 of Question 2. The IPC directive should direct the agencies involved to provide an Implementation Plan to the IPC within a specified period.

**Group 3:**

**Question 1:**

Yes, but it comes down to funding stream problems and who will pay for what. It would be necessary to indentify the funding streams for creation and maintenance of database systems. The existing policy and culture will also need to be addressed. The existing culture is to protect sources. It needs to be determined what is better, the organization as a whole vice the specific agency goals. People need to be empowered. When they are not empowered they may tend to focus only on their agency goals. It is important to build relationships that allow for exchange of information.

When drafting a policy it needs to be determined what party will enforce it. (i.e.: IC501 states write to release to the lowest level. What is the accountability to ensure we are doing what we are supposed to do?)

A change in the way agencies think is needed. An agency believes that once you open up your doors you open up your budget. A policy of openness is needed to encourage information sharing. This not only involves government and military, but also industry. A policy needs to be established as to how to encourage industry to share. (Need to invite them and not place demands on them.) Trust and resiliency are key.

**Question 2:**

Who is driving the effort should determine who is present. A stakeholder board should be created to discuss and take the information back to their respective agencies. There should be an understanding of the issues to bring all players together. Perhaps there should be guidelines versus a formalization of policies. People to people guidelines work for sharing. Internal protection of information only comes into play as middle management concerns are relayed from upper level management. Younger analysts seem more willing to collaborate.

Group 3 Question 2 cont:

There should be an awareness of all stake holders' PIR's. This may help map out areas of collaboration. There should also be a standard use of terminology and nomenclature throughout the agencies with regard to information sharing. Different collaborative systems still do not interface. (i.e.: Intellipedia, Jabber) Agency personnel need education on classification levels with regard to gathering information.

### **Question 3:**

The guidance needs to come from the top down and be clearly identified to all agencies. Previous answers comment on implementation as well. There should be a full review from all levels of the current policy with comments on the same. The QAR (DOD) should be used to formalize a policy. The appropriate people should be gathered to review the policy. An "outside the box" approach is necessary to get past current practices. The Office of Management and Budget controls agency budgets. Perhaps this would be a way to motivate agencies to create new policies.

A model is needed to create new policy. From there information requirements will follow. The top-down approach is currently how this is done. The NORAD planning group called for a top-down vision. The successful trend now seems to be from the bottom up. NORAD may provide good leverage for US-Canadian issues.

## **Group 4:**

### **Question 1:**

Yes, effective information sharing policy can happen along with dispute resolution as long as all issues including dispute resolution are disclosed up front. The policy is already in place; our current problem is the culture. The current culture is to protect our sources. Additionally, the question of who is paying is a problem. Successes must be shared with partner agencies, ensuring financial and budgetary benefits are distributed. The question that comes to the forefront is can we get the proper technology to share.

### **Question 2:**

Agency heads and deputies should get together and hammer out a framework for a policy. Mission sets and partners should be identified. Agencies that want to partner should ensure they can offer each other what they need.

### **Question 3:**

Those who help create the policy own it and are empowered to implement it. This depends on the scope of the mission. The larger the policy's scope the higher the empowerment hierarchy, from local government up to UN authority.