MFR 01012981
corrected

Event: Joan Dempsey

Type of Event: Interview

9/11 Closed by Statute

Date: November 12, 2003

Special Access Issues: None

Prepared by: Gordon Lederman

Team Number: 2

Location: Office of the President's Foreign Intelligence Board (PFIAB), New Executive Office Building

Participants – non-Commission: Joan Dempsey, [redacted] (Office of Congressional Affairs, Central Intelligence Agency [CIA])

Participants – Commission: Lloyd Salvetti, Gordon Lederman

(U) BACKGROUND.

(S) Ms. Dempsey has been Executive Director of the PFIAB since July 2003. From May 1998 to July 2003, she served as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence for Community Management (DDCI/CM). From July 1997 to May 1998, she was Chief of Staff to the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI). Prior to that position, she was a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense responsible for intelligence. She also has served as Director of Intelligence at the Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA) and various other intelligence-related positions at the Department of Defense (DoD).

(U) HER RESPONSIBILITIES AS DDCI/CM

(U) When she started in her position as DDCI/CM, she was not told anything specific about her functions and responsibilities. The 1997 Intelligence Authorization Act created the positions of DDCI/CM, Assistant DCI for Collection (ADCI/C), and ADCI for Analysis and Production (ADCI/A&P), and made the DDCI/CM the third-ranking leader of the Intelligence Community – behind the DCI and DDCI. The ADCIs reported to the DDCI/CM pursuant to the Act. However, the DDCI/CM is not in the chain of command for the CIA itself. The Act was written without the DDCI/CM but with ADCIs. Following negotiations between the DCI and the Congress, the position of DDCI/CM was created because having the ADCIs report directly to the DCI would make the DCI's span of control too large. The Act was essentially the result of Senator Warner wanting to forestall even bigger cuts to the IC; at the time, Congress favored creating a Director of National Intelligence (DNI) but settled for the ADCIs and a DDCI/CM. Congress created the position of DDCI/CM to reinvigorate the IC, but neither DCI Deutch nor DCI Tenet wanted it.

DECLASSIFIED
E.O. 13526
9/11 MFR Project
KW 6/2014

(S) Upon becoming DDCI/CM, Ms. Dempsey drafted a letter to herself that the DCI signed and that set forth her functions and responsibilities. The letter charged the DDCI/CM with 4-5 major tasks the responsibility for building a budget, developing a strategy, planning, and establishing a senior acquisition executive. She had "maximum authority" to build the budget program. She had no execution authority over the budget. She put the budget program together by looking at shortfalls in the community, determining needed capabilities, and assessing which priorities were needed for the nation.

(U) She reallocated funds across programs by asking program managers to identify their lower priorities. However, the program managers would respond with the "gold watch," meaning that they would offer up programs that she would be disinclined to cut. Due to difficulty in cutting programs, she attempted to get "new money" for the IC and to use that money for new or additional capabilities.

(S) Beginning in 1998, there were four primary mission areas that were modified only slightly: (1) counterterrorism; (2) nonproliferation; (3) developing new ways to operate in secret (countering denial and deception, [redacted]; and (4) focusing on enduring and emerging threats to the United States, which was a "thinly masked attempt" to get back to global intelligence. There was no priority order among these four mission areas. The strategy of focusing on these four areas uber alles was embodied in briefings for the DCI, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and Congress. There was no document embodying this strategy.

(U) She specified that, according to the Act creating the DDCI/CM position, she had no managerial responsibility for the IC (by which she may have meant, no managerial responsibilities for the internal workings of agencies). The Armed Services Committees would have refused to support the Act if she had been given any managerial responsibility. For example, she had no responsibility for the day-to-day functions of the DCI Counterterrorist Center (CTC) nor over the CIA. She characterized her position as "extremely limited" in what she could do, but she pushed the envelope of her authority.

(U) RESOURCES

(S) When she began as DDCI/CM, it was the eighth year of reductions in the IC in terms of dollars and people. The manner of the reductions was largely determined by the agencies themselves. Reductions were taken by having HUMINT (the Directorate of Operations [DO] and the Defense HUMINT Service [DHS]) get out of Africa and analysis ignore Africa, leaving the IC with little residual capability in Africa. [redacted] was dismantled as well.

(S) Congress legislated 2.5% personnel reduction per year through 1997, and DCI Deutch extended those reductions through 2000. However, even though there was a 25-30% drop in personnel, manpower as a percentage of the total budget increased. One reason for the increase was that the U.S. Government changed its rules for personnel counted in budgeting. OMB decided not to keep a separate line item for Executive Branch

personnel retirement funds and instead had each agency add such a line item to its budget. OMB shifted money to the agencies to cover the retirement costs, but OMB's funds did not cover increases in personnel benefit costs, which were continually rising. NSA's costs for personnel approached 50% of its budget.

(S) A second reason for the increase in personnel costs as a percentage of the agencies' budgets was that there was a policy decision by the Administration and the Congress not to effect any reductions in personnel – aside from U.S. Air Force and National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA) programs – due to concerns that firing people would create counterintelligence problems.

(U) Handling personnel costs was an "enormous management challenge" throughout the 1990s. There is no way to measure what reductions in budgets and increased personnel costs did to the U.S. intelligence capability. There was no attempt to "get under the reductions" and ascertain their effect. The lost capabilities cannot be recreated easily.

(U) TERRORISM

(S) While the IC moved out of Africa, Usama bin Ladin (UBL) moved in. Counterterrorism funding grew; additional funding for counterterrorism was not diverted to non-counterterrorism targets. However, it is erroneous to believe that merely increasing funding for counterterrorism will lead to increased counterterrorism effectiveness if other larger capabilities (such as global HUMINT) are being reduced. If there is no HUMINT capability, then counterterrorism will not be as effective because larger issues will be missed. In other words, terrorists utilize a network, and counterterrorism cannot be effective if it only looks at part of the network. Accordingly, she concluded that funding needed to be increased both for counterterrorism and for global issues. She started as DDCI/CM in May 1998, and by midsummer she had pushed [redacted] increase that turned into a [redacted] The increase came less with OMB's support and more as a result of House Speaker Rep. Gingrich and the House Appropriations Committee. She did brief OMB on the request, and there was unhappiness in the Administration about her request. She was threatened with being fired.

(U) Elaborating on her relationship with OMB, she said that essentially OMB gives agencies a top-line budget figure, generally based on the previous year's figure but minus some "passbacks" to OMB. OMB's figure would sometimes include specific instructions concerning which programs to cut. In general, the budget process is "not documented – it's informal." The budget process is the "business" of the Administration, with constant negotiation and give-and-take among the players. The process has been the same across all five Presidential administrations she has witnessed.

(U) DoD must have a Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) every four years, focusing on DoD's missions. She ran panels for the first two QDRs while she was in DoD. When she became DDCI/CM, she realized that the 2000 QDR was approaching and that there was a danger that DoD would try to make the IC the "bill-payer." Accordingly, in

September 2000 she instituted QDR-like process in the IC (the quadrennial intelligence community review [QICR, or "quicker"]) to prepare the IC for the DoD QDR by emphasizing capabilities and missions. She took the National Intelligence Council (NIC) product Global Trends 2010 to ascertain what global issues and to ensure that the 2000 budget would build capabilities for 2010. She added a focus on homeland security. The QICR determined that homeland security would be a focus but that the IC was doing very little on this issue – in fact, no one in the U.S. Government had homeland security as a priority. She thought that homeland security would be an important although not primary issue. The IC needed a policy review to ascertain what it should do regarding homeland security, but that review never occurred. In March/April 2001, she started briefing the results of the QICR. The Deputy Secretary of Defense told her that counterterrorism would never be an issue and that no money would be available for it. She acknowledged that homeland security was just one of a number of issues against which the IC had little capability. The QICR did not conclude that there would be a domestic terrorist attack. As an aside, she noted that DoD tried to make the IC a "bill-payer" but that the Deputy Secretary of Defense warded it off.

~~(S)~~ Counterterrorism was handled predominantly in the CTC. Counterterrorism was certainly seen programmatically as within CTC. CTC grew through supplementals. Congress – not the Administration – added the money for CTC. CTC's budget increased while the budget of the rest of the IC decreased. However, the CIA's regional offices lost strength, which weakened CTC's capabilities. Moreover, NSA was cutting linguists across the board – no one in the U.S. Government really cared about Urdu.

~~(S)~~ Hard target reviews were carried out only for regional targets, not for terrorism. However, [redacted] hard targets boards did look at terrorism to the extent that terrorism was part of those targets.

~~(S)~~ Creating CTC was a good thing but caused problems because it fostered the sense that giving money to CTC would solve the terrorism problem. Instead, other non-CTC capabilities were needed. As an aside, she noted that a lot of CTC effort in the early- to mid-1990s was focused on Hizballah.

(U) CTC built its program and determined what additional resources it needed. There was no outside review of CTC, and she was not involved in CTC's internal strategizing. As previously mentioned, she had no responsibility for CTC's day-to-day activities.

(U) STRATEGY OF THE IC

(U) The DCI's Strategic Intent was "philosophical," stating how the IC can work together more as a community with respect to information technology, collaborative production, security procedures, etc. The words "strategic intent" were chosen for the strategy because they implied that the document was "less binding." Aside from the CIA, no other agency in the IC works for the DCI. Agency heads saw the DDCI/CM as an "enormous threat" and wanted to look like they were operating as a community without being bound. No one is rewarded or accountable for being part of the community –

9/11 Classified Information

rather, non-CIA program managers are held accountable by the Secretary of Defense for how they run their specific agencies. At the offsite for program managers that preceded the drafting of the Strategic Intent, each program manager indicated that he would make his agency's information technology interoperable across the community but that his agency's information technology system would have to solve his agency's problem first. Yet this attitude will never result in development of an IC-wide database structure.

(U) RESISTANCE FROM THE AGENCIES TO HER LEADERSHIP

(U) The biggest resistance to her leadership of the community came from the CIA, which went over her head to the DCI "all the time." CIA did so daily, while other agencies would try to do so in a more clumsy manner. The DCI would sometimes back her up and would sometimes side with the CIA. Merely having the DCI sign the letter delineating her functions and responsibilities was a "big win." In sum, she occupied a "unique but uncomfortable position." Any letter that she sent to the DCI would be automatically distributed to the CIA. She started off with one lawyer from the CIA General Counsel's Office and ended up with five; CIA probably stocked her office with its attorneys in order to "protect its equities." She tried to move her office to Tysons Corner because she had constant problems arising from being located at the CIA's campus. However, the DCI would not agree to her move. In sum, the CIA thought that she was too community-oriented, and the IC thought that she was captured by the CIA.

(U) DCID 1/1 impacts program managers only by implication. The only reason that she as DDCI/CM was effective in controlling the program managers was because she would obtain more money for them – and they had a "three-day memory" when it came to her success at obtaining increased funding. Yet the "right thing" for the community butts up against the "right thing" for specific agencies. The DCI's relationship with program managers was very personality-dependent. NSA and CIA never had a "particularly happy marriage."

DCI Tenet was essentially the CIA Director. He had a meeting every other Monday with program managers (along with the DDCI and the DDCI/CM) and once per week with one program manager (meaning that he met with each program manager individually once per month). In contrast, DCI Tenet met with the CIA Executive Director every day. DCI Tenet deferred a lot to her as DDCI/CM, but she knew better than to take issues to him – especially if CIA opposed her position or if there was internal IC disagreement. Her decisions were not directive to the agencies unless agencies were willing to recognize her authority or decision on the issue at hand.

(U) FOREIGN LIAISON

(S) There is long-standing unhappiness with the ADCI for Foreign Liaison, Amb. Hugh Montgomery. The IC regards his office as "the office of 'no.'" Her letter delineating her responsibilities and authority specifically stated that she has responsibility for looking at foreign liaison. She wanted to strengthen relations with second parties. She would work the issue, get everyone's perspective, and then should decide how to proceed – and

usually found herself going against Amb. Montgomery's staff. Her decisions were occasionally not in line with NIMA's or CIA's, but her decisions survived because the IC had general agreement that there needed to be a different approach to foreign liaison. Her vision of foreign liaison 9/11 Classified Information All that the "noforn" designation did was slow the sharing of intelligence because the IC almost never failed to share "noforn" 9/11 Classified Information yet such sharing was delayed due to the need to obtain waivers/clearances. Everyone agreed in principle to change the system, until it got to the point 9/11 Classified Information She did travel on behalf of the DO on occasion, but basically because as a stand-in for the DDCI or DCI.

(U) INFORMATION-SHARING WITHIN THE IC

(U) For the first three years of her tenure as DDCI/CM, she had a Chief Information Officer (CIO) for the IC who worked on building a common information architecture to allow the IC to connect seamlessly. However, enforcement of the CIO's decisions would have to be made by the DCI and the Secretary of Defense, but no one could explain to the DCI and the Secretary of Defense the benefits of a common information architecture. CIA complained that a common information architecture would slow its communications network. More generally, she hated when there were decisions that had to be made by the DCI and the Secretary of Defense, as they were "paralyzed by their staffs." The difficulty in resolving IC-wide issues is an outgrowth of the fact that 90% of the IC is in DoD.

(U) THE IC BUDGET

(U) The DDCI/CM had no execution authority. It was obvious that – as program developers – they were only working half of the issue. Agency reports on how they actually spent their money were sent to OMB and bypassed the DCI. With OMB support, she started to do a limited execution review, but only four to five hours once per year and only focusing on budget details rather than whether specific capabilities were procured. She did not receive new authority to do the execution review – rather, OMB started sending agencies' execution reports to her. Execution matters because the IC's money is appropriated to the DoD, not to the DCI. And DoD can withhold money or "assess taxes" if DoD does not like the way that an agency is conducting its business. Finally, DoD can use money appropriated to a DoD intelligence agency to pay a DoD bill unrelated to intelligence. In sum, agencies are much more responsive to who provides them their money.

(U) The biggest issue is that there is no one looking to see if the money was used to buy the capabilities for which the money was appropriated in the first place.

(U) As to whether the DCI should receive "execution authority" or an "appropriation," she thought that they are essentially the equivalent in practice, although she thought that a law could be drafted to give the DCI execution authority without appropriating the funds to the DCI. Essentially, having the DCI receive an appropriation or have execution authority means that the DCI must have a comptroller. The DCI has a Program Analysis & Evaluation staff to build the budget but lacks a comptroller to ascertain how the money is actually spent.

(U) Section 104(d) of the National Security Act, which permits the DCI to reprogram funds under certain strictures, is a "feckless law." With respect to the stricture that the DCI may move money from one agency to another only with the consent of that first agency, no agency will allow money to be moved from it because that agency would be viewed as admitting that it has no other priorities.

(U) COMMUNITY MANAGEMENT

(U) When she started as DDCI/CM, 20% of the Community Management Staff (CMS) was "cadre," a term she defined as people dependent upon her and the DCI rather than an IC agency. When she left, 50% of the CMS was cadre.

(U) The DCI failed to combine personnel systems in the CIA, so there is no hope that the DCI would be able to combine personnel systems across the IC. Accordingly, her vision was to establish a personnel system modeled on the Goldwater-Nichols Act. She wanted a cadre of people who had special education and would receive the designation of "intelligence community officer" (ICO). Obtaining that designation would be necessary for promotion, which would allow people to stay in their own agencies.. DCI Deutch agreed to it, but DCI Tenet overruled it because CIA disagreed with it by saying that the proposal was "unfair" to CIA: Agency heads wanted reciprocity, meaning that if an agency sent a person to another agency, that first agency would receive a person in return. However, the CIA claimed that it only had a limited number of slots to receive ICOs and that CIA would send out [redacted] ICOs but only receive a few ICOs back. The CIA proposed that a CIA employee moving from the DO to the Directorate of Intelligence (DI) be considered an ICO. She would have agreed to it, but CIA's proposal fell by the wayside. She termed personnel reform proposal as a "hardy perennial" that would keep being revisited and rejected. There is no document in which DCI Tenet rejects her personnel proposal; instead, DCI Tenet just refused to enact her proposal. Cross-community training is well-regarded and well-attended by everyone except CIA; CIA does not advertise such training internally. If we want more information about such training and the ICAP personnel-rotation program, we should ask [redacted] at CMS.

(U) There were constant problems getting proposed reprogramming of funds approved by Congress (which must be done for transfers of funds above the threshold of $10 million). Sometimes she would go straight to Congress, past OMB, concerning reprogramming.

9/11 Classified Information

9/11 Closed by Statute

(U) The IC had Principals and Deputies Committees, the Principals being agency heads and the Deputies being the Assistant Secretary of the State Department's Bureau of Intelligence and Research and comparable positions. The DCI never used these bodies to control the IC. The DCI's calendar never allowed for meetings to be scheduled. The Deputies Committee never met after DCI Tenet's first six or eight months as DCI.

(U) She did not believe that the 'slush fund' of the National Reconnaissance Office had any long-term effect on IC management.

(U) THE ADCI POSITIONS, AND THE REQUIREMENTS PROCESS

(U) The ADCIs worked "more or less" for her. They do not have responsibility for day-to-day implementation of a strategic direction for the IC.

(U) Charlie Allen always worked for her. She gave him top-cover and the lead on various issues; he would keep her informed of his progress. To the degree that her staff did any day-to-day management of the IC, it was done by Mr. Allen – mainly because the IC regarded collection as so dysfunctional and the targets to be so overwhelming. However, it took the IC a long time to get to that realization. When she first became DDCI/CM, she spent one quarter of her time on matters related to the ADCI for Collection. Mr. Allen interacted wit the National HUMINT Requirements Tasking Center (NHRTC) rather than with the DO proper – a situation which has not changed dramatically, although the DO regional offices are more willing to deal with Mr. Allen now.

(U) Customers frequently circumvent the established requirements process by calling collectors directly and stating, "My boss the ____ wants collection on ____." The collection requirements system was not designed as a nuanced system. For example, a colonel that calls NSA six times generates six requirements, while a request from the DCI to NSA is only considered one requirement. The system is not designed for dealing with nuance and is heavily skewed toward volume and supporting the warfighter. Yet warfighters do not always know what the best way is to support their requirements. U.S. Central Command would always receive coverage of the Iraqi no-fly-zone even if the IC would miss an important nonproliferation target as a result.

(U) The ADCI/Administration was her deputy but she found that she had no authority over him. During the negotiations concerning the 1997 Intelligence Authorization Act, Congress wanted a DDCI for Administration and Management. As the ADCI/Administration has no actual authority to administer or manage, his position was essentially useless and he therefore became a deputy to the DDCI/CM.

(U) The ADCI/Analysis & Production is the most well-articulated part of the legislation. Mark Lowenthal actually drafted this provision. The problem is that all analytic organizations actually work for their program managers, not the ADCI/Analysis & Production. She finds it "delicious" that Mr. Lowenthal – who is now ADCI/Analysis &

Production – is now experiencing the frustration of implementing the statutory provision that he drafted.

(U) HIGH-LEVEL MANAGEMENT OF THE IC

~~(S)~~ Asked about how she dealt with the DCI's 1998 "Declaration of War" memorandum, she said that she took out the special activities components and sent the memorandum to the IC's leadership. They replied that they cannot redirect resources for counterterrorism because they have other priorities, even though the DCI wrote that he wanted "no resources spared." Mr. Allen tried to redirect collection efforts. Ms. Dempsey disagreed with the assertion that "there was no there there" with respect to the memorandum, but she said that there was not a lot of follow-through. The war on terrorism was regarded as yet another mission that was a number-one priority, and counterterrorism did not compete well against supporting military requirements that consumed 100% of intelligence assets. As long as the overwhelming majority of the IC sits in DoD, the IC will always prioritize warfighting.

(U) The DCI is the titular head but not the real head of the IC. Giving the DCI an appropriation would be a "minimalist change for a 'maximalist' effect." There is no chance of more serious reform than that. There have been 27 studies recommending that the DCI's authority be increased.

(U) As to whether the DCI should be split from the CIA Director, the main reason she initially did not support the creation of a DNI was because she thought that the DCI's power-base lies in CIA and that special activities conducted by the CIA would not receive sufficient oversight without an official appointed by the President overseeing it. However, she has changed her opinion as a result of her experience as DDCI/CM. The DCI should be an official separate from CIA Director. The DCI should not be the lead briefer to the President; the DCI should attend those briefings but should not be the person defending the briefings – that is for the briefer. Creation of a DNI would bring civilian control of intelligence. The Director of CIA would be a CIA officer. However, creating a DNI without giving the DNI any new powers would not work. The DCI would go to Principals Committee meetings and would bring the CIA Director or the NSA Director or the NIMA Director as appropriate. The DNI should not have his/her hands in intelligence on a day-to-day basis; the DNI does not need to know where every IC asset is stationed. The DNI is not the senior analyst; rather, the DNI is the adviser to the President. The President does indeed need an objective perspective, which is what the DNI and the IC would provide.

(U) What really matters is money and people. She had proposals on what to do about people, such as giving the DCI control over all senior personnel in the IC – that would be enough to bring the IC under the DCI's control. However, that was a "bridge too far" because of the conflict between Title X and Title V. As a result, she came up with her proposal for the ICO designation.

(U) If she were 'queen for a day,' she would consolidate CIA and NSA (keeping the Service Cryptologic Elements [SCEs] in DoD] because SIGINT and HUMINT provide intelligence that the President cares about. SIGINT analysis never gets any credence, but it is critical. NIMA would be kept in DoD except for a small support group at NSA/CIA. Appropriating money to the DCI is an enormous improvement over the current situation, but that is not the same as having the DCI direct day-to-day activities of the IC. Still, appropriating funds directly to the DCI would allow the DCI to set priorities for the IC. Appropriating funds to the DCI will help – but will not solve – the influence of the warfighters over collection.

(U) All combat support agencies must be reviewed by J-5 of the Joint Staff to show that they can meet operational plan requirements – a review which is of the utmost concern to NSA and NIMA. The review is very elaborate and determines whether the agencies have sufficient capabilities. The DCI – with a staff of [redacted] people – cannot compete with the 20,000 people who work for the Office of the Secretary of Defense. There is an issue of scale which is never considered – the DCI can never deal with all of the issues, so the DCI has to pick his fights carefully.

(S) There is no DCI system comparable to the J-5's review of NSA and NIMA, but she established the Military Requirements Board (MRB). DoD's Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) insisted that national intelligence systems meet defense requirements even at the expense of national requirements. She refused to allow FIA to have a direct downlink to tactical units, a requirement which DoD wanted the DCI to fund. The DCI backed her on this decision. The Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff sent a letter to the DCI to complain. She had no analytic basis for fighting DoD's view, so she established the MRB to look at national requirements just as the JROC looks at defense requirements. Now, the MRB can compete with the JROC.

(U) She fought the creation of the Undersecretary of Defense for Intelligence (USD/I) for four years. She lost the battle against Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld because creation of the USD/I did not affect CIA directly, and the DCI needed Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld's concurrence on other issues. She opposed the USD/I because the Secretary of Defense delegated his authority over national intelligence agencies to the USD/I, and no staff element in OSD will choose a national requirement over a DoD requirement. The USD/I meets with the directors of NSA and NIMA daily, while the DCI meets with the directors of NSA and NIMA individually once per month and on a group basis twice per month. However, she cannot prove that the creation of the USD/I has had any effect so far.

(U) CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

(U) The last Administration did not support Congressional initiatives regarding counterterrorism. The Administration did not veto supplementals for more counterterrorism spending but did not increase the IC's budget allocation for counterterrorism the next year, either. Congressional authorizers cut the IC's budget every year – if they challenge this statement, they are lying – and it was the appropriators

who increased the IC's funding (in terms of appropriations bills and supplementals). The supplementals originated in the appropriations committees, as the authorizers have no jurisdiction over supplementals. Pursuant to Section 104(d) of the National Security Act, the appropriators can assume an authorization role, authorization being necessary for Congress to pass appropriations for the IC. In the 1990s, there was little agreement in Congress on the level of IC funding. The appropriators used Section 104(d) to appropriate funds via bills and supplementals. She suggested that we ask the Congressional Budget Office to review the history of Congressional authorization and appropriation, as she believes that the text of the bills do not capture the full extent of the history of their passage.

(U) Regarding non-budgetary Congressional oversight, she asked rhetorically how many substantive hearings on counterterrorism were held by the oversight committees. The IC spent two years responding to Senate Select Committee on Intelligence (SSCI) demands on China, which were made for the purpose of making the Clinton Administration look bad. The SSCI is one of the most politicized bodies in Congress, particularly as intelligence has been emerging into the public eye. Up until the 1990s, the oversight committees were not politicized. In the mid-1990s, the SSCI staff became terribly divided and politicized. The House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence had weak staff, and the staff never recovered from the death of J.Millis. The staff has pet projects and is too focused on details. In the 1980s, there were political issues associated with intelligence, but they were generally byproducts of other issues – such as whether arms control could be verified; the agencies of the IC themselves were not the focus. Today, it is the IC agencies themselves which are the subject of political focus. It used to be that the SSCI was more strategically-oriented and the HPSCI more detail-oriented.

(U) She was always in battle with Congress regarding the Congressional schedule of authorizations. Members do not even read the bills. Each page of the authorization report had multiple taskings, which lead to micromanagement of the IC. The IC was totally tied-up with requests for information, and Congress never did anything with the information once it received it from the IC. The IC has appealed to Congress to obtain relief from certain requirements. In sum, she said, oversight is "deplorable" and the staffs are "out of control."

(U) THE PFIAB

(U) The PFIAB has a very broad charter. It advises the President and makes recommendations on intelligence issues that the PFIAB or the President select. There are sixteen members, namely fifteen individuals from outside government and the PFIAB's Executive Director. The PFIAB's Intelligence Oversight Board reviews whether the IC has violated laws; every agency in the IC sends in quarterly reports as to whether any laws have been broken.