Presenter: Mr. Terry Halvorsen, Acting Department of Defense Chief Information Officer

December 5, 2014

Telephonic media roundtable with Acting CIO Halvorsen.

ACTING CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER TERRY HALVORSEN: Okay, I just made my brief remarks.

Let's get started.

STAFF: Okay. Hey Joe Gould, we're going to start with you, for questions.

Q: Okay. I just had to come off mute. Yeah, I guess I'll ask a general one. What, you know, what is the status of -- of the JRSS effort? How -- how far along are you? When do you expect to be complete? And what are the implications for the -- for the services?

MR. HALVORSEN: Good question, Joe. So, I expect that we will have JRSS capability, and I'm not trying to mince words here, fully up by the end of '16. That won't mean that JRSS is fully complete, but I will have the main capabilities I need. It will be able to improve the security of the entire DOD network. I will have vision and connectivity throughout the DOD network by the end of '16.

Where the services are right now, as a matter of fact, I just did a three-star review board this morning where I briefed kind of the final numbers. I think everybody's now in agreement with the numbers – and "numbers" being cost. And that we will -- we will continue with the execution plans that we have developed. And we'll make, like I said, '16 will be the initial capability, which will cover the DOD networks globally; will give us some increase in some areas of security. And by the end of '17, I'll have the full capability available with a few spots left to make sure that the full capability is deployed.

STAFF: Joe, do you have a follow-on?

Q: Yeah, can you say a little bit more about what happened at the three-star review? You said it was a review of the costs involved.

MR. HALVORSEN: No.

MR. HALVORSEN: I just told you what I can. It looks like everybody's in concurrence. The three-star board is in response to the budget planning, and of course that's not been passed. All I can tell you is they seem to be in concurrence with the plan.

Q: Okay. Thank you.

STAFF: Okay. Next question goes to Joe (Marks).

Q: Hi. Excuse me. So in the -- can you tell us what's been stood up? So give us an update on what's been stood up so far in terms of the JRSS? And have you seen significant differences in the resiliency from attacks in those areas?

MR. HALVORSEN: The answer is no. And only because what has been deployed is we've got it deployed in San Antonio. I have -- when I say "deployed," I have the (stacks ?) and I'm doing active testing in San Antonio and in Europe. I have not passed live traffic yet over the JRSS.

What I can tell you is that all of the tests show that I'm going to get the results. But I want to be clear, I mean, one of the questions here is: Have you been logging fewer attacks? JRSS won't -- won't log fewer attacks. It will probably end up logging more attacks. What it should do is make sure that -- that either the response and mitigations -- stopping -- (inaudible) -- attacks gets higher.

And all the testing shows that's going to work, but I'm not -- I don't have live traffic on JRSS yet.

Q: Thank you.

STAFF: Joe, do you have a follow-on?

Q: No, thanks.

STAFF: Next? Mike?

Q: I'm Mike McCarthy, Defense Daily.

Can you -- just for some of us who are less familiar with it, can you talk about what JRSS is? When the initiative began? What the goal is?

MR. HALVORSEN: So, the goal is easy -- a more secure, defendable and responsive, more C2-able, command and controllable, Department of Defense integrated network. What JRSS physically is is a collection of servers, switches, with some increased band-width, with a software package -- and it's not just a piece of software, it is a set of software tools, that allow us to do better traffic analysis, and then share that traffic analysis in a more timely, in many cases almost immediate way with all of the network control nodes at the same time.

Q: So is this part of the JIE?

MR. HALVORSEN: It is the cornerstone of the JIE. And I think you have previous statements I made. JIE is a concept and it is a concept that frankly you'll never reach the end of. It's the continual evaluation of what does your joint information environment look like. JRSS is a concrete -- the first cornerstone event that we are doing as part of our movement toward a more integrated joint information environment.

STAFF: Mike, do you have a follow-on question?

Q: I'm okay. Thanks.

STAFF: Okay. Molly, over to you.

Q: Sure -- Molly Walker from Fierce Government IT Thanks for your time. I really appreciate it.

So, is JRSS in multi-protocol label switching in particular? I'm seeing things about DOD saying that it's providing unprecedented cyber-situational awareness. Could you possibly provide specifics on those expanded capabilities in situational awareness? And kind of the tangible benefits in terms of that?

MR. HALVORSEN: I can talk to you about some of the benefits. I am not going to be able to talk to you about specifically what it does in terms of capabilities. What it does at this level – and what I can discuss is when JRSS, when it is in place, and I note in your question you used it present-tense. Anybody who is saying today that we're getting capability from it, we're getting capability in the testing. It is not -- and I will keep saying it -- it is not deployed live today.

What it does when we are done, it reduces kind of the access points to our network, for one thing. It gives us a more limited number of control points, which immediately limits your physical footprint, which is a good thing. But it has some standard software tools and server capabilities, really, that give me better traffic analysis, let me see, let the network operations centers, wherever they'd be, see through the entire network with better fidelity.

And what that means is with better traffic analysis to know what's going on in a network. It gets us the ability to have some sensors that will give us better tip-off, more precise and timely tip-off about what's going on on the network so that we can take more responsive action in -- and I say more in terms of speed and options of what I can do when I see an anomaly on network traffic.

STAFF: Sandra, I know you told me you didn't have a question. I just want to still offer you the option.

Q: Yes, one has come up. Thank you. This is Sandra with Signal magazine.

You said that it's not live yet. Is the going live coincide with the end of 2016 timeline that you have?

MR. HALVORSEN: No, we will -- we will actually start going live with pieces of the JRSS before the end of 2016. I suspect we will start going live with some of the locations. And I'm not going to give you the specific locations I'm going to go live with, and you can probably guess why I wouldn't want to do that.

But we will go live with some of this right after the first of the year. And then we'll keep going live. By the end of '16, we'll have the full capability throughout the network to do most of what we want. By '17, we'll be almost -- we'll be 98 percent fully complete by the end of '17.

STAFF: Okay. Sean?

Q: Hi. This is Sean Lyngaas with Federal Computer Week.

Can you please compare and contrast your approach to JRSS with that of your predecessor? Specifically, what directives have you --

MR. HALVORSEN: The answer is no. You know my approach. There is no gain, no value in me comparing what my predecessor did and what I'm doing. What I'm telling you I'm doing is I have focused on getting JRSS, those stacks, deployed as the cornerstone of JIE. And that's my answer.

Q: Okay, but what specific directives have you given since becoming acting DOD CIO?

MR. HALVORSEN: Specific directives I've given in response to JRSS is that we would get JRSS done; that we would hold a series of meetings, which we have, to reduce the cost of JRSS; that we would completely understand what it meant to engineer JRSS; and that we'd have an architecture and a delivery plan to execute the majority of JRSS capability by the end of FY '16.

Q: Can I have a follow-on?

STAFF: Absolutely, Sean.

Q: You know, Mr. Halvorsen, can you please elaborate on the meetings to lower the cost of the JRSS?

MR. HALVORSEN: No.

MR. HALVORSEN: I can’t. This is all -- this is not approved budget yet, so you know I can't do that. I can tell you that we've driven the cost down. As soon as I can, I'm very happy to share that, and I think you guys know I'm very transparent. But until all that's approved and the budget's out, I can't give you those numbers. That's just the law.

STAFF: Okay. Claudette?

Q: Hi. This is Claudette from DOD News.

Mr. Halvorsen, can you talk a little bit about how both the JRSS and the business process review actually fit into the larger JIE timeline? And, well, you've already hit the second part of my question, was just what capabilities will they provide?

MR. HALVORSEN: Yeah, the BPSR is a complementary action. It is not -- I don't want to say it's in any way -- they're not interdependent. They're complementary. What the BPSR is doing is DCMO, who has lead, in conjunction with CIO, for the first time is doing a complete business process and systems review of what we call the fourth estate -- DCMO being the chief management officer, or business officer for the department -- my -- obviously, myself being the CIO owning all the business systems, in addition to owning the -- (inaudible) -- fighting systems.

BPSR is focused on the business systems and the business processes of the department. How do we get them better? And "better" could be defined in changing the process, changing the system, or just better integrating the current process with the current systems.

Why I say they're complementary -- obviously, as we look at that, and we focus on some of the results of that better buying, how do we better execute our contracts, that all helps the JRSS and overall JIE effort, not just move faster, but move in a more business approach that keeps us having our costs not just go down, but making sure that we understand what we're paying for, how we're evaluating the value of what we're paying for, and that we are, you know, doing complementary, and that we're getting the value for the capability that we need.

STAFF: Claudette, do you have a follow-on question?

Q: Yes, ma'am. So, you -- you mentioned that this is sort of tied in with better buying power, which sort of crosses all departments in the -- in the Defense Department. Do you think any other DOD organizations are going to be asked to go through this -- this business process systems review?

MR. HALVORSEN: Well, to be clear, when I say the fourth estate, that is all of the PSAs. So, that would be, like, acquisition, personnel and readiness, policy. In addition, we are doing all of the Defense agencies. Like, Monday morning, DISA starts part of that review. We've already started the Defense Logistics Agency, but all of the Defense agencies will be done. They will share all that data with the military departments. And, to be clear, the military departments have started some of this effort a little earlier. So, they're, at the department level, are a little farther along.

I think when we are done with the fourth estate, we will have dialogue with the military departments, look at what position they're on, and probably do some selective target activities that run the full gambit from the military services to the department agencies, all the way up to the department leadership PSA.

Q: Thank you.

Q: Yeah, hi. Jared Serbu from Federal News Radio. Thanks for doing this.

Back on JRSS real quick -- I suspect this might fall into the category of non-approved budgets again, but -- but is there any detail you can give us on the JRSS migration plan, you know, MILDEP by MILDEP?

MR. HALVORSEN: Well, okay, so I will say this. The JRSS migration plan is not being done MILDEP by MILDEP. It's being -- it has to be done by what makes sense for the network. Now, that said – I will tell you this. The initial rollouts are probably more focused around Army and Air Force, or some internal reasons in this department. The later rollouts will be more focused. That doesn't mean that there's not Navy and Marine Corps impact up front. And that doesn't mean it won't be Army-Air Force-back. But initially, the rollout impacts more Army and Air Force. Then it goes to Navy and Marine Corps. That's really the specificity I can give you. Because if I actually told you any more specificity, anybody, frankly, who wanted to, could do some back engineering

and know where I'm doing this. And I actually don't want that to be known right now until it's all done.

Q: Yeah, I got it.

MR. HALVORSEN: Okay.

Q: Okay. And then on BPSR, can -- I mean, you mentioned DISA and DLA. I think last time you talked to us, you told us that you had just finished DCMO and CIO. How many more have you done? And can you talk a little bit more about what's involved in the scope of the reviews? I mean, obviously, it's probably not just IT and business systems, right?

MR. HALVORSEN: No, no. From a systems standpoint, it is just business systems. And from a process standpoint, it is just business processes. But think about that a minute. So, I'll ask you a question. Tell me a business that DOD is not in.

MR. HALVORSEN: Yeah. So, I think that answered your scope question. This is a really big scope. So, we have completed CIO. And DCMO. Since Dave Tillotson, who is kind of my partner in arms here isn't here, I'll talk -- I'll give you some results. In CIO's case, one of the things that we were able to do -- and I won't give you the specifics exactly. I'll just say in terms of contracting, I was able to reduce the CIO budget by $10 million in both '15 and '16. Dave Tillotson saw some similar results. He's still working on finalizing his.

We are also starting I&E, infrastructure and energy shortly. We're about three quarters of the way through P&R. And I'm just going to say what you might expect. As we focus on business systems and processes, we have seen in many cases that ability to improve both the process in the system. Because I -- you know, I think part of what's happened in the past is, you build a process. And then a lot of times, what happened, when you brought in IT -- because the process was still for IT -- you just took the process you had and you put it on a system. That's not what you want to do. You really want to look at what can IT do to help the process. And what can the process, do the that better adapts, in some cases to IT.

The result of that has been both more effective and efficient output. And I suspect in the end that we will see a fairly -- when I say big number, you know, I think we're talking in the end of this process that we'll have the opportunity to save in the millions of dollars when we're done.

Q: Okay, but so far, the only two organizations that are done -- and you can give a total dollar figure, say, of -- or just DCMO and CIO, so...

MR. HALVORSEN: Yeah, I want to be clear. What I can give you is not the total dollar figure that will be saved in CIO. It's the total -- it's -- the figure I'm giving you is what I've done from, like, the first set of results. As you get these results, some of them take longer to implement than others. We were able to quickly do some of the contracting things within CIO that has actually let me realized in '15 -- that means right now -- a $10 million savings, and in '16, a $10 million savings.

Q: Great. Thanks.

STAFF: Okay. Joe Gould, we'll start with you for the second round.

Q: Thanks.

Back on JRSS, can you talk about what lessons you may have learned from the testing in San Antonio? Possibly, can you be a little bit more specific on what the tests were, and, you know, and what they revealed about the way to move forward?

MR. HALVORSEN: Hey, Joe, you're probably not going to like as much as I can give you. And I'm sorry about that. Here's what I can tell you. The testing revealed that we had the capacity sized right. We needed to do some fine-tuning of the software set and tools and I can't get more specific than that, that our architecture connection plan appears to be sound.

You always say, "appears to be sound," until I have connected all of the DOD. You know, obviously, you can't say that it was -- that it all worked. Every indication that we have right now, and it's been thorough testing, is that it is going to work as designed. We also did learn that we probably have to do a little more education to the operating force about what this means. And we're taking that for action now.

STAFF: Joe, do you have a follow-up?

Q: Well, yeah, what's the gap for the operating force? Would -- you know, what do they...

MR. HALVERSON: Hey, Joe, I mean, here's my answer. If they need some more training on some of the specific capabilities, that I'm not going to talk about.

Q: OK.

MR. HALVERSON: I can't. I hope you all understand. I mean, generally, I think you guys are -- I'm as open as I can get. I cannot tell what capabilities I'm deploying, because as soon as I do that, somebody starts taking action against the capabilities and I don't want that to happen.

STAFF: OK. That was Joe Gould. That was you, correct?

Q: Yes, that's me. Thank you.

STAFF: OK. Because we've got two Joes. Joe Marks?

Q: Hi. I hope this isn't so. The NDAA includes the provision to change the management in cyber, tests and training ranges. And there's a line in there that talks about creating a standardized language for cyber that would then ultimately be deployed inside the JIE. Can you talk about what that might look like?

MR. HALVERSON: Joe, if you ask me that after the NDAA has passed and it's law, I'm happy to. But right now, you're asking me to speculate on legislation that's not law.

Q: Has he talked about the -- (inaudible)?

Q (Joe Marks): OK. Sorry about that. I was jumping on and off of speaker. So leaving NDAA out of it then, can you talk about trying to get a standard cyber language across the services and how the (CIE ?) might aid that?

MR. HALVERSON: I can, if you can narrow this question down. I mean -- I mean, when you say a standard cyber language, tell me what you really mean? If you're asking me am I trying to get both cyber technical and mission standards across the DOD, the answer is working with the operational commander, Mike Rogers in CYBERCOM to write the policy that does that, yes, I am. And we are interested in doing it, so that we can get to a more integrated cyber enterprise from all aspects of the mission.

Am I going to be able to go into details with you on what exactly that means, no. When the law comes out, if it gets signed, I'll be able to tell you a little bit more about what would be the timeline for us to get to those cyber standards. And at a point, I'll be able to tell you what some of the cyber standards we're talking about are.

But I mean, I could give you one today. One of the things we need to standardize is how data is output. Now I'm getting very technical now, but you want data to come out across the network in a fairly standardized technical transport specification, so that it's easier to look at it and know that it's the data that you expected to get.

And that's about as much as I could say.

Q: Thank you very much.

STAFF: Okay, Mike, over to you.

Q: Hi, this is Mike. A couple of questions on cost, back to cost. What is the expected cost to get you through 2016, your goals there, and 2017 that you mentioned earlier, those milestones?

MR. HALVORSEN: And Mike, I'll be happy to tell you what that is after the budget's been passed and I know -- and I know what it is.

I cannot mention -- I can't tell you the costs. I can tell you we're working to refine it. I can tell you we've been able to reduce it by better looking at how we would buy things, by re-engineering some efforts, by looking at how we maybe integrated some more commercial products, but I can't talk about '16 and out-year numbers yet because it is the budget season and they have not been approved yet.

STAFF: Mike, did you have a follow-up?

Q: Yeah, yeah. I have a separate question. To what degree are you employing open architecture approaches to this? And if you are and when you are applying open architecture approaches, how are you dealing with having the open systems with encountering the cyber threats sometimes are more associated with open systems?

MR. HALVORSEN: So here's what I can tell you, and you're not going to like this answer. To the greatest extent possible, I am certainly using open architecture. And I'll go one step further. While, yes, open systems can end up with some additional cyber problems, in some cases, open systems, particularly if they're widely used, because of the level of the review that they get on their code in the open market from an initial standpoint are, frankly, better coded from a security standpoint than some of the non-open systems.

And we are learning more and more about how to take open systems that start with cleaner code and actually better protect them because we then know what some of the vulnerability -- we can limit some of the known vulnerabilities.

Now, that doesn't mean we're always going to use completely open systems. But every place we can, because I think it makes sense -- certainly makes sense from a cost standpoint -- we'll use open architecture, and we'll even use, in some cases, you know, open applications.

Q: Hi, it's (Molly Walker at Fierce Government.

My question's on BPSR. I was kind of looking, trying to get a feel for what the scope is of the BPSR and it looks like if, you know, reviewing that things align with department goals and checking that programs have the proper resources, things like that, what about -- (inaudible) -- services. (off mic)

MR. HALVORSEN: Let me interrupt -- let me interrupt you. That's not what we're doing.

Q: Okay.

MR. HALVORSEN: It is absolutely going down to the process and systems level to see, does the process, does like, steps A, B, and C at any process, are they supported well by the systems? Do we need to redesign a process so that it can better use the systems? Do we need to redesign a system because it doesn't support the process? Do we even need the separate processing system? And part of the questions are, are we even in the right business processing system to begin with?

So the reason I interrupted… I want everybody to understand, this is not the traditional are you just basically aligned? This is much like business would do a deep dive into the business lines of every piece of the department.

So one of the questions that we have to ask is are we even in the right -- if we're in the right business line within the business line, am I executing it the right way?

MR. HALVORSEN: And I'll give you an example. One of the things the -- the data may be starting to show for us, and we have some more analysis is in the IT area, am I in enough of the

commercial space, meaning should I be moving some of what today while it's the right business line to be in, is the operation of that line better done in a more commercial environment or a government environment?

And I'll be very factual with you. The data today is starting to show that in some business lines like data storage, certain levels of data movement I ought to be more in either commercial storage, commercial cloud than I am today if I'm going to be the most efficient and effective.

STAFF: Molly, do you have a follow-up question?

Q: Sure, so thanks for saying that further. But I think in what you're saying about the shift to more commercial, what does this mean for DISA and the services that it provides for the department?

MR. HALVORSEN: It certainly could mean for DISA as we find the analysis, that some of DISA's work would shift. You're going to see it. I know people are going to ask you, so it's a good time for me to jump into it.

With respect to cloud, DISA is not going to be the only cloud buyer in the Department of Defense. In this case, some of DISA's work will shift from being the cloud buyer to ensuring that whoever buys the cloud, whether it's the services or another agency, makes sure that when we're buying it that the cloud security requirements are fully met and understood by whatever vendor is going to, you know, provide that cloud service to us.

In other cases, it could mean that you would see DISA shift some of its effort from say unclassified to classified data because for various reasons, I think you would all -- could figure out that the classified data I have will not be as cost-driven in the final decision as the unclass data. It will probably for a heavier weight of security stay, with inside the government.

But just because does -- stays in the government doesn't mean I don't want to get more efficient. You may see DISA working more about how do they work and partner even with the intelligence agencies to be able to get more effective and efficient in our classified storage of data.

STAFF: Sandra?

Q: Yes, apologies if I missed it, but are you able to give us an update on your status of acting directors there since -- especially since the Navy had posted -- a want-ad for your job at the Navy?

MR. HALVORSEN: Yes, I'm still the acting DOD CIO. I am in no -- I have no Navy responsibilities. I have not had -- I know that kept getting out in the press. I have not had any Navy responsibilities since the end of June. I am the acting DOD CIO, and -- and that status will be the same until somebody higher than me tells me that that's changed.

STAFF: Sean?

Q: Hi, I was hoping you could describe if -- if JRSS is a cornerstone of JIE, what -- what's another piece of -- of -- of JIE that will -- that will, you know, compliment JRSS? And what -- from what

you've learned so far about JRSS and the tests that you've done, how's that gonna inform the next step in JIE?

MR. HALVORSEN: Don't know that it's so much about informing, that JRSS is the cornerstone, and it's got to set the network conditions as a whole, then I need to do the next step. The next big step of JIE is for us to develop and, at first, an unclassified coalition network, which means that anybody who is a current partner in any mission we're doing, via war mission or say humanitarian mission, that we can quickly stand up what will have to be a commercially based -- and that doesn't mean commercially operated.

Hear what I'm saying -- commercially based, frankly, commercially probably encrypted out of the box network that can operate efficiently enough that everybody who you might want to put on that network, be it allies, you know, non-government organizations that would support you in times of humanitarian assistance at an affordable level that's able to stand up quickly.

One of the things we were trying to work out is what does quickly mean. But I can tell you it's kind of 30 days or less -- and how much less is -- is what we're working on -- that can also exist within the basic network structure that JRSS is going to provide.

STAFF: Scott?

Q: Hey, Mr. Halvorsen. This is Scott Maucione from "Inside the Pentagon". Regarding the business process systems review, will you be using any of the -- the outcomes from that and what you learned from that to kind of help your decisions with the new powers that you have with acquisition trying to decide -- working in -- in conjunction with ATL at least on changing the IT acquisition process?

MR. HALVORSEN: I think the answer to that is -- is yes. And I think you will see initially -- and I want to stress partnering with acquisition. Secretary Kendall has been, in my opinion, one of the strongest leaders the department has ever had in making the acquisition process better in every way. I mean, he's done buying power 1.0, 2.0, 3.0. Everything we're doing is aligned with that.

I think you will see some of the initial things are looking at it how we better kind of collapse contracts where, as we look across the department we see that people are contracting for the same type of things. I'll share with you -- and I can't share with you the exact numbers -- but I'll share with you that with inside CIO and DOD, one of the things that we noted is that there were variations within the same sets of contract services that we were buying that didn't, frankly, make a lot of sense and that we went for the variations that was lower cost to say why isn't that the standard.

And with Secretary Kendall's help, we were able to make some very quick contract decisions that got at least our two agencies more aligned with where the benchmarks kind of would be in buying those services. And one of the ways -- that's a big part of the $10 million within CIO that we saved. So we are certainly aligned with Secretary Kendall and maybe even more aligned, we're following his leadership in what he's been trying to do with his improvements of the acquisition process.

STAFF: Scott, do you have a followup?

Q: Yeah. I was just wondering if that could possibly lead to more of a streamlined acquisition process for IT? Is that possibly in the future with this new authorization that you have or power?

MR. HALVORSEN: I don't think my authorization power is what leads to a streamlined acquisition process. And I am a little hesitant to say "streamlined acquisition process," because that sounds like every acquisition for IT goes through completely the same process. And that's not true, and it shouldn't.

What I hope that we will get to, and I think that Secretary Kendall has laid it out, the objective is to get an acquisition process that for whatever you're requiring, be it IT or others, that the process is tailored the best way possible for that particular acquisition to maximize speed -- or optimize speed, cost and effectiveness, and efficiency to the greatest extent possible.

I think we are on track to help that effort significantly, as we partner with acquisition in taking some of the data that we're learning from the BPSR results.

STAFF: Jared?

Q: Hi, can I move beyond the scope of JRSS and BPSR? I feel like we've handled those fairly well.

Q: All right, thanks. I'm gonna try and ask an NDAA-related question without asking you to comment directly on the NDAA, because, as you pointed out, you and Dave Tillotson have worked very closely together, without Congress formally putting you together.

Can you -- can you talk about what you see as the synergies between those two organizations and kind of what the two offices have done together without legislation?

MR. HALVORSEN: Yeah, I can.

I do think -- and I think most people agree, today the integration of the process and the IT systems that support process are key to any successful business operation. Since I own the IT systems and Dave owns the business processes, or at least the review of those business processes, as chief – management officer, it makes sense for us to go together to look at the operation elements that are conducting the business processes using the systems that they have.

That synergy is really, really good. I think both Dave and I also come from service operational backgrounds, so we're able to look at that, understand what the services have done.

And I do want to say, the services, the military departments, should be well-commended. They had moved farther in that effort than, say, the fourth estate, the DOD level. That's just a fact.

As we start looking at that -- and the other thing we've done is we have the Defense Business Council, which now the CIO and the DCMO co-chair. That includes, besides the fourth estate, the Defense Business Council, all the CIOs and DCMOs of the services. So we're able now to take what I would say are cross-functional problems, or share cross-functional solutions and good data much more effectively throughout the department than we were before we had that kind of coordinated effort.

Q (Joe Gould): I guess I have a question about the status of the way ahead on cloud computing. What the -- I guess it's been, that's been released recently. What are the implications of that? What's -- and are there some companies already in the -- in the pipeline to receive (Level 3.5 ?) certification?

MR. HALVORSEN: What we are changing, kind of two things, really major things, in the -- in the way we will get cloud.

First one I've talked about, we have authorized the services the ability to do with their own contracting acquisition authorities to engage directly.

The reason for that is it just gives me more volume capability to be able to go out there.

The second major change was to better define -- it's one of the reasons we ran the pilot -- what are the cloud security requirements? And it's more than just define requirements, it's how to define them in such a way that I wasn't being overly prescriptive in a solution set, so that the industry could come back to me with some different technical answers that would demonstrate that they met the security requirements.

That is probably, next to opening up the volume, is the next biggest change. It's how were we, DOD, able to translate the requirements in a way that we could be more open to different sets of security solutions.

Yes, there are some companies in the pipeline. I'll have to check and see if I can get back to you on telling you who the companies are that are in the pipeline.

I think I could safely say this, if you look at the big cloud companies that are in industry, yes, you now know who the big cloud companies are that are in the pipeline.

The one that is currently approved to do up to Level 5 is Amazon, but there are a group of Amazon-like companies right on the verge of getting that approvable. And this is also, in terms of security, around using the FEDRAMP and the risk analysis processes inside FEDRAMP

STAFF: Joe Marks?

Q: Yeah, just a big picture, broad, overall, what's been the trend on cyber, not penetrations, but on pinging reports on -- across DOD?

MR. HALVORSEN: Joe, I'm sorry, I'm not following the question, so can you get a little more specific?

Q: How resilient -- what's the trend in resiliency of DOD networks?

MR. HALVORSEN: The trend in resiliency of DOD networks is up.

Q: Can you be more specific than that?

MR. HALVORSEN: Nope. Hey, Joe, think about what you're asking me. Whatever I give you -- you know, I don't know how to answer than other than the trends are up.

If you're asking me are our overall position postures better, yes, they are. Am I gonna tell you how and why they're better? No, I'm not.

STAFF: Molly?

Q: So, just to back to this and then you were saying about trying to find some data output standards, could you possibly say where were you looking for those standards? I know DHS and – MITRE(?) (inaudible) collaborated on some threat reporting standards with (sticks and taxi ?) I believe it's called.

Are you looking to government -- you know, other government agencies and departments for this, or what?

Mr. HALVORSEN: Yes. Yes, to the "or what?".

You know, where it's appropriate, it makes sense for the Department of Defense, where it's appropriate, for me to help drive and use whatever the industry and market as a whole is using as a standard, and I'm going to do that.

There are some cases where I have to be more specific about the output data standard because all the security and the classification, all the things you would think about.

In those cases, I am still involving industry, but the lead might switch to where we would look to internal organizations, to DOD or other government organizations that are leading those efforts.

STAFF: Scott?

Q: I know this is probably -- the answer is probably no, but is there anything more you can say about the EMP directive that you put out and, you know, where the status is on hardening things and what kind of timeline the DOD has on that?

MR. HALVORSEN: Scott, can you say that one again? You broke up there a little bit for me.

Q: Sure, yeah. The EMP directive, is there any, you know, updates on that? Can you say anything more about, you know, DOD's timeline on hardening its equipment for EMPs and things like that?

MR. HALVORSEN: I can say that we are on track with the timeline and that the things that were in the memo are being done.

STAFF: And, Scott, I'll chime in very quickly. We will get you some detailed answers to those off-topic questions.

MR. HALVORSEN: Yeah, but I'll tell you, Scott, and you probably know this, they're not gonna be much more detailed than I just gave you, for all the reasons we've talked about before.

MR. HALVORSEN: But we are on track. We are doing the things that the memo described in EMP moving forward.

STAFF: Jared?

Q: Sure. So, it looks like a couple weeks ago Secretary Work signed out an updated version of the directive that outlines your roles and responsibilities. It -- without being able to see the previous version, it's hard to tell whether that's just a technical cleanup or if it actually changes the emphasis of what you do or gives you some more go-dos.

Do you happen to know?

MR. HALVORSEN: Yes. It gave me a lot more go-dos. I mean, it certainly clarified the role of CIO, and I'll tell you what this is responsive to. Obviously, as we look at CIO and cyber, there are some things that are overlap on that, and there are some things that aren't.

So this is, in effect, along with all of the other things that DOD is doing to clarify CIO's role, to clarify what the principle cyber adviser's role is, to kind of clarify where the operational commander has a bigger role, what is the CIO's relationship to the operational commander, to cyber PSA. And I think it did that very well.

Some of the specific things it did -- back on topic -- it now made me the co-chair, along with the CMO of the Defense Business Council. That, I think is a big movement forward, because they do have to work together.

It clarified for the operational commander -- the CIO -- I don't have operation responsibility for cyber offensive or defensive missions. I set some policy guidelines, but we shouldn't have operational authority for that, and I think that's kind of -- that's kind of what it tried to do in general.

Q: Was that ambiguous before?

MR. HALVORSEN: I wouldn't say it was ambiguous before. You didn't have a principle cyber adviser before, and we, as you know -- it's about 18 months that we've recently solidified and

codified what USCYBERCOM is going to do. So as you brought those organizations to effect, you had to clarify what was everybody's lane.

STAFF: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to let that be our last question.

STAFF: Thanks for your time. All right. Take care, everyone.

MR. HALVORSEN: Thanks.

-30-