

ICS 83-4018
17 May 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: D/PPS *PPS*

FROM:

[Redacted]

IHC

25X1

SUBJECT:

Meeting with Don Latham, DUSD (C³I), regarding
Joint IC/DOD Computer Security Project

1. On 11 April 1983, [Redacted] and I met with the following DOD representatives to discuss the Intelligence Community (IC) Computer Security Project:

25X1

- o Don Latham - Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (C³I)
- o Steve Walker - Director, Information Systems DUSD (C³I)
- o Col. John Lane - Deputy Director, Information Systems DUSD (C³I) (U)

2. Mr. Latham and the other DOD representatives were briefed by [Redacted]

25X1

[Redacted] on the scope and nature of the joint IC/DOD Computer Security Project and offered their support of the effort. Mr. Latham agreed that DCID 1/16 is not adequate to address today's processing environment and that new policies and guidelines need to be developed. He also agreed with the need to provide guidelines to tell people how and where to go to get their systems accredited for processing various types of materials. There was a general discussion of the difference between the terms certification and accreditation. [Redacted] noted the following:

25X1

- o Certification can be compared to the services that Underwriters Laboratories (UL) performs in industry. UL establishes certain standards for various types of equipment and then conducts tests on a sample set of that equipment to insure that manufacturers are continuing to develop products in accordance with these standards. Electrical equipment is thereby certified for use by the American public. In general a similar certification process for computer systems is being developed for DOD [Redacted]

25X1

25X1

- o Accreditation can be compared to the process that a city inspector goes through when he inspects the materials in a new home and determines that the home meets or exceeds the minimal standards specified in the city's building codes. Accreditation is a specific process of reviewing a single system (home) which is built using several "certified" components. [Redacted]

25X1

3. [Redacted] noted that CSEC's efforts to certify computer systems are just getting underway. He also noted that the proposed effort by [Redacted]

25X1

[Redacted]

25X1

would address the issue of expanding the role of the Center to include all intelligence components, including CIA, [redacted]

25X1
25X1
25X1

[redacted] further
[redacted]

4. [redacted] explained that the effort would include threat assessments for three different groups:

25X1

- o A highly sensitive threat assessment to be developed for a very limited number of appropriate officials.
- o A somewhat refined assessment at a high level of classification that can be reviewed by a larger number of people.
- o A sanitized and summarized threat assessment produced at a lower level of classification that can be reviewed by a larger number of people including industrial participants. [redacted]

25X1

[redacted]

25X1
25X1

[redacted]

25X1

[redacted]

25X1

[redacted]

25X1

8. Steve Walker asked if the effort would be limited to the intelligence organizations since it was an Intelligence Community sponsored effort. He noted that policy for processing intelligence data is covered under DCID 1/16,

[redacted]

[redacted] noted that the effort would be broader than the intelligence organizations since military C³I networks transmit and store intelligence data derived from IC sources. [redacted] identified this as the reason we were

25X1

25X1

25X1

seeking C³I's support for the effort. Mr. Walker noted the difficulty of the task if we tried to address the entire C³I problem. He suggested that we focus on the "I" portion of the problem and that we develop strong and effective policies that could be used to influence the C³ side of the house.

[Redacted]

25X1

9. Mr. Latham again supported the effort and directed that either Steve Walker or Col. John Lane be the point of contact for C³I [Redacted]

[Redacted]

25X1
25A1

Page Denied