

Testimony of
 The Honorable Clay Johnson III
 Before the
 Subcommittee on Intelligence Community Management
 of the
 House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

Wednesday, September 17, 2008

My testimony today provides a general update on the security and suitability clearance reform efforts. I defer to the representatives from the Office of Personnel Management (OPM), Department of Defense (DOD) and Office of the Director for National Intelligence (ODNI) to provide specific comments on their respective activities.

The security clearance determination community is pleased with the improvements that have been made to the security clearance determination process since 2005 and the resulting performance improvements.

Average Days to Investigate and Adjudicate
 For Cases Whose Investigative Work is Performed by OPM*
Most Timely 80% of Cases Closed

	ACTUAL		IRTPA Goals	
	2005	June – August 2008	12/06	12/09
<i>All initial clearances</i>	228 days	76 days	120	60
<i>Top Secret</i>	387 days	103 days		
<i>Secret/Confidential</i>	195 days	71 days		

*90% of total investigations

The vast majority of these performance improvements to date have resulted from increased investigation and adjudication capacity and increased accountability for security clearance determination performance. We are actively working on the process reforms that will be necessary to realize additional performance improvements, to achieve the 12/09 IRTPA performance goal of an average of 60 days for investigations and adjudications for the top 80% of requests, “to the extent practicable.”

- In an April 30 Report to the President, we defined the different categories of reform, and we have organized and staffed to develop and adopt each category.
- We have committed to deliver to the President by December 15, a report on the specific reforms to be adopted, by when, at what cost, to produce what level of performance.
- We have established a governance structure, the Performance Accountability Council, to help ensure the reform plan is implemented as promised, and agencies establish reasonably aggressive performance goals and are held accountable for accomplishing them.
- Coincidentally, we have committed to reform the suitability determination process as it also impacts whether and how quickly a new Federal or contractor employee can start to work.

As the Government Accountability Office (GAO) encourages, we have:

- Specific aggressive performance goals or date-certain plans to develop/refine them;
- Set and followed strategic priorities, choosing first to focus on the biggest opportunities to increase capacity and accountability before turning to process reform opportunities;
- Date-certain plans to define the specific way forward to full reform. These plans will be delivered to the President;
- Set implementation and performance goals, even when not called for by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004, and been very transparent about our performance relative to those goals; and
- Shown significant, continuous performance improvement.

Thank you for inviting me to testify on this important issue. I welcome your questions.