

**STATEMENT CHAIRWOMAN ANNA ESHOO
FOR HEARING ON DNI'S
500 DAY PLAN
December 6, 2007**

I call the subcommittee to order. Today, the subcommittee will receive testimony on the Director of National Intelligence's 500 day plan.

This subcommittee is particularly well-suited to consider this issue. Our mission includes specifically overseeing the DNI's management of the Intelligence Community and implementation of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act.

We will focus this morning on these three things:

- What the Intelligence Community has set out to accomplish under the "100-day plan" and "500-day plan";

- What concrete accomplishments have occurred to date;
and
- How do these accomplishments address the goals for intelligence reform set forth by Congress almost three years ago.

Much thought and deliberation has gone into how to improve the capacity of the Intelligence Community. In the wake of 9/11 and U.S. invasion of Iraq, Congress passed the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act, which among other things created the Director of National Intelligence. That was in December 2004.

We were not able to identify much progress during the first two years, perhaps because the first DNI did not set forth a clear set of objectives. Shortly after Director McConnell assumed that position, early this year, he issued a 100-day plan with goals for progress on improving coordination within

the Intelligence Community. This plan covered the period May to mid-July 2007. A few weeks later, after assessing progress under this plan, the Office of the DNI set forth a more ambitious 500-day plan, which will expire with the end of this Administration.

- First, the DNI published exactly what he intended to do, with specific leads, milestones and deliverables;
- Second, he established an office to monitor progress, maintain momentum, and ensure accountability;
- Third, the 500-Day Plan's goals pilot projects flow from the first 100 Day Plan and move many of the initiatives into an implementation phase.

We appreciate the transparency and accountability built into this approach. We will have this entire hearing in open session because the issues in the 500 Day Plan are about management and process and can be discussed meaningfully in an unclassified environment. Still, I caution

my colleagues to be mindful that some of the discussions of these matters that we have had in Committee have involved classified material that should not be referred to here.

This hearing will consist of two panels. In the first panel we will hear from Dr. Don Kerr, the Principal Deputy DNI, and Mr. David Shedd, the Deputy DNI for Policy, Plans, and Requirements. They will provide testimony on the progress under the DNI's 100-day and 500-day plans.

- The second panel will take a broader view of the DNI, assessing its progress in achieving the goals of the Intelligence Reform Act and improving our intelligence capabilities.

As the witnesses give us their progress report, please do so in a way that will have our members understand how the reforms are actually affecting intelligence performance.

The goals listed in the unclassified 100-day and 500-day plans have not always shown the metrics for how the initiative will improve intelligence coordination.

There has been bipartisan concern and criticism that the DNI staff is another layer of bureaucratic process without added operational value. I hope the witnesses will be able to demonstrate otherwise. We also encourage them to identify the key areas that are the DNI's top priorities to ensure that the most important initiatives don't fall through the cracks.

Areas this subcommittee is particularly interested in are information sharing, security clearances and systems acquisition. These are areas of long-standing problems, and we want to hear how what you have accomplished in your 100 Day Plan will translate to real and enduring change.

I hope that our second panel witnesses will find your testimony instructive as they take a broader perspective on the DNI. They have great experience with intelligence reform, and intimate knowledge of the workings of the intelligence community.

As observers may have noted, Congress is still struggling with the appropriate role for the DNI. Members of Congress are debating whether the DNI should be purely a coordinating entity, or whether it must be involved directly in operational aspects of the community. I would welcome the witnesses' views on this debate.

I now recognize the ranking member, Mr. Issa, for any comments he might have.