

SAC HEARING QUESTIONS

QUESTION AREA: Intelligence Community Personnel Issues
(NAPA Study Implications)

QUESTION #3: The NAPA study was provided to this Committee in January 1989. It makes over 40 separate recommendations regarding intelligence personnel management policies and compensation practices. Do you agree with all of the recommendations in the report? If not, with which actions do you disagree and why?

ANSWER: My letter forwarding the NAPA Report to the Congress indicates my broad agreement with the Report's recommendations. In particular, I strongly support the recommendations that advocate greater flexibility in personnel management for all Intelligence Community activities. I also support NAPA's conclusions on the need for better Community coordination of personnel management initiatives. Indeed, I have already established a senior coordinating group--as recommended by NAPA--to enhance the effectiveness of personnel management across the Community. As you are aware, NAPA's recommendations cover a very wide range of actions. While all have merit, there are questions of feasibility, priority, timing, funding, technical details of implementation, and so on that must be answered before firm decisions to proceed can be made. My senior coordinating group, through a system of specialized interagency working groups, is now actively reviewing the NAPA Report to identify the areas with broad Community application that should be acted on first and to propose an implementation plan. A relatively clear outline of where we are headed should be available by mid-summer. Concurrently, individual agencies are moving ahead on those recommendations that have agency-specific aspects.

STAT

SAC HEARING QUESTIONS

QUESTION AREA: Intelligence Community Personnel Issues
(NAPA Study Implications)

QUESTION #3A: The NAPA report made a number of recommendation that have financial implications, if implemented, how do you intend to deal with them?

ANSWER: In broad terms, virtually all of the Report's recommendations have financial implications, as all concern personnel and thus affect staffing and retention. Some of the recommendations, however, have direct funding consequences. My approach to dealing with such recommendations will be consistent with my approach to any funding or budget issues. Foremost is the need to treat such issues within the context of the National Foreign Intelligence Program as a whole. In the coming years a great deal of Community scrutiny will be given to many NFIP issues and initiatives, including hardware and operational programs as well as personnel needs. Financial implications of NAPA's recommendations will be dealt with alongside these other issues as part of my effort to formulate an NFIP that addresses our most pressing requirements. I expect that initiatives that are uniquely applicable to specific agencies will be treated similarly by senior program managers.

25X1

SAC HEARING QUESTIONS

QUESTION AREA: Intelligence Community Personnel Issues
(NAPA Study Implications)

QUESTION #3B: Will implementation of any of the recommendations require significant additional resources in FY90 or FY91?

ANSWER: As you are aware, many of NAPA's recommendations are conceptual or concern realignment of personnel policies. There is very little in the Report or its recommendations in the way of the technical details of implementation. Until those details are fully understood and described, accurate funding estimates will be difficult to obtain. As I mentioned, a senior coordinating group is now evaluating the Report to more completely assess implications --including costs--of the recommendations. A full answer will await completion of that effort. In some instances, however, where agency-specific recommendations are involved, projected funding costs are better understood. Agency personnel officers will discuss those matters directly with appropriate Congressional Staff as part of the oversight effort.

25X1

TOP SECRET

SAC HEARING QUESTIONS

QUESTION AREA: Intelligence Community Personnel Issues
(NAPA Study Implications)

QUESTION #3C: The report highlights a number of areas where benefits and allowances are not uniform for overseas intelligence personnel, and recommends that your authorities be extended to permit you to align benefits and allowances with those the Secretary of State establishes for U.S. government civilian employees overseas. Do you intend to take action to create equity in overseas intelligence compensation?

ANSWER: Achieving equity in overseas compensation is, of course, a desirable objective, and I intend to work towards it. As you are aware, however, the NAPA project staff prepared a separate case study on this issue after the completion of the main Report. The case study points out the extremely complicated nature of overseas compensation and notes the need for further work on the part of the Community (working ultimately in conjunction with the Congress). Because of the scope and technical details of the issues involved, I have referred this problem to my senior coordinating group (discussed previously), which is examining it alongside several other compensation recommendations. The group believes that the overseas pay issue will be among the most complicated ones that it treats.

25X1

Page Denied