

CRS Report for Congress

Critical Infrastructures: Background, Policy, and Implementation

Updated January 8, 2007

John D. Moteff
Specialist in Science and Technology Policy
Resources, Science, and Industry Division



Prepared for Members and
Committees of Congress

Critical Infrastructures: Background, Policy and Implementation

Summary

The nation's health, wealth, and security rely on the production and distribution of certain goods and services. The array of physical assets, functions, and systems across which these goods and services move are called critical infrastructures (e.g., electricity, the power plants that generate it, and the electric grid upon which it is distributed).

The national security community has been concerned for sometime about the vulnerability of critical infrastructure to both physical and cyber attack. In May 1998, President Clinton released Presidential Decision Directive No. 63. The Directive set up groups within the federal government to develop and implement plans that would protect government-operated infrastructures and called for a dialogue between government and the private sector to develop a National Infrastructure Assurance Plan that would protect all of the nation's critical infrastructures by the year 2003. While the Directive called for both physical and cyber protection from both man-made and natural events, implementation focused on cyber protection against man-made cyber events (i.e. computer hackers). However, given the physical damage caused by the September 11 attacks, physical protections of critical infrastructures has received increased attention.

Following the events of September 11, the Bush Administration released Executive Order 13228, signed October 8, 2001, establishing the Office of Homeland Security. Among its duties, the Office shall "coordinate efforts to protect the United States and its critical infrastructure from the consequences of terrorist attacks." In November 2002, Congress passed legislation creating a Department of Homeland Security. Among its responsibilities is overall coordination of critical infrastructure protection activities. In December 2003, the Bush Administration released Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7, reiterating and expanding upon infrastructure protection policy and responsibilities. In June 2006, the Bush Administration released its National Infrastructure Protection Plan. This Plan presents the process by which the Department of Homeland Security intends to identify those specific assets most critical to the United States, across all sectors, based on the risk associated with their loss to attack or natural disaster, and then to prioritize activities aimed at maximizing the reduction of those risks for a given investment.

This report discusses in more detail the evolution of a national critical infrastructure policy and the institutional structures established to implement it. The report highlights five issues of Congressional concern: identifying critical assets; assessing vulnerabilities; allocating resources; information sharing; and, regulation.

Contents

Introduction	1
Federal Critical Infrastructure Protection Policy: In Brief	2
The President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection	3
Presidential Decision Directive No. 63	4
Restructuring by the Bush Administration	8
Pre-September 11	8
Post-September 11	9
Department of Homeland Security	13
Initial Establishment	13
Chertoff Reorganization	15
Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006	15
Policy Implementation	15
Government - Sector Coordination	15
Appointment of the National Infrastructure Advisory Council	18
Internal Agency Plans	19
National Critical Infrastructure Plan	20
Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ISAC)	22
Identifying Critical Assets, Assessing Vulnerability and Risk, and Prioritizing Protective Measures	23
Issues and Discussion	26
Identifying Critical Assets, Functions, and Systems	26
Assessing Vulnerabilities and Risk	27
Allocating Resources	27
Information Sharing	29
Regulation	30
Appendix	32
Federal Funding for Critical Infrastructure Protection	32
The Preparedness Directorate's FY2007 Budget Request and Appropriations for Infrastructure Protection and Information Security and Other Relevant DHS Budget Activities	33

List of Tables

Table 1. Lead Agencies per PDD-63	5
Table 2. Current Lead Agency Assignments	16
Table A.1. Critical Infrastructure Protection Funding by Department	32
Table A.2 Funding for the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate	34

Critical Infrastructures: Background, Policy, and Implementation

Introduction

Certain socioeconomic activities are vital to the day-to-day functioning and security of the country; for example, transportation of goods and people, communications, banking and finance, and the supply and distribution of electricity and water. Domestic security and our ability to monitor, deter, and respond to outside hostile acts also depend on some of these activities as well as other more specialized activities like intelligence gathering and command and control of police and military forces. A serious disruption in these activities and capabilities could have a major impact on the country's well-being.¹

These activities and capabilities are supported by an array of physical assets, functions, information, and systems forming what has been called the nation's critical infrastructures. These infrastructures have grown complex and interconnected, meaning that a disruption in one may lead to disruptions in others.²

Disruptions can be caused by any number of factors: poor design, operator error, physical destruction due to natural causes, (earthquakes, lightning strikes, etc.) or physical destruction due to intentional human actions (theft, arson, terrorist attack, etc.). Over the years, operators of these infrastructures have taken measures to guard against, and to quickly respond to, many of these threats, primarily to improve reliability and safety. However, the terrorist attacks of September 11, and the subsequent anthrax attacks, demonstrated the need to reexamine protections in light of the terrorist threat, as part of an overall critical infrastructure protection policy.³

¹ As a reminder of how dependent society is on its infrastructure, in May 1998, PanAmSat's Galaxy IV satellite's on-board controller malfunctioned, disrupting service to an estimated 80-90% of the nation's pagers, causing problems for hospitals trying to reach doctors on call, emergency workers, and people trying to use their credit cards at gas pumps, to name but a few.

² The electricity blackout in August 2003 in the United States and Canada illustrated the interdependencies between electricity and other elements of the energy market such as oil refining and pipelines, as well as communications, drinking water supplies, etc.

³ Besides loss of life, the terrorist attacks of September 11 disrupted the services of a number of critical infrastructures (including telecommunications, the internet, financial markets, and air transportation). In some cases, protections already in place (like off-site storage of data, mirror capacity, etc.) allowed for relatively quick reconstitution of services. In other cases, (continued...)

This report provides an historical background and tracks the evolution of such an overall policy and its implementation. However, specific protections associated with individual infrastructures is beyond the scope of this report. For CRS products related to specific infrastructure protection efforts, the reader is encouraged to visit the Homeland Security Current Legislative Issues webpage and look at the Critical Infrastructure Security link.

Federal Critical Infrastructure Protection Policy: In Brief

As discussed further below, a number of federal executive documents and federal legislation lay out a basic policy and strategy for protecting the nation's critical infrastructure. To summarize, it is the policy of the United States to enhance the protection of the nation's critical infrastructure. Critical infrastructure has been defined as those systems and assets, the destruction or incapacity of which would:

- cause catastrophic health effects or mass casualties comparable to those from the use of weapons of mass destruction,
- impair Federal departments and agencies' abilities to perform essential missions or ensure the public's health and safety,
- undermine State and local government capacities to maintain order and deliver minimum essential public services,
- damage the private sector's capability to ensure the orderly functioning of the economy...,
- have a negative effect on the economy through the cascading disruption of other critical infrastructure,
- or undermine the public's morale and confidence in our national economic and political institutions.⁴

The federal government will work with states, localities, and the owners and operators of critical infrastructure (in both the private and public sector) to identify those specific assets and systems that constitute the nation's critical infrastructure. Together, these entities will assess those assets' vulnerabilities to the threats facing the nation (natural or manmade, i.e. all hazards), determine the level of risk associated with possible attacks or the impacts of natural events on those assets, and identify and prioritize a set of protection measures that can be taken to reduce those risks. Primary responsibility for protection, response, and recovery lies with the owners and operators.⁵ However, the federal government holds open the possibility

³ (...continued)

service was disrupted for much longer periods of time.

⁴ White House, Homeland Security Presidential Directive Number 7, *Critical Infrastructure Identification, Prioritization, and Protection*. Released December 17, 2003. A more general definition is given in statute (P.L. 107-71, Sec. 1016): "... systems and assets, physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems and assets would have a debilitating impact on security, national economic security, national public health and safety, or any combination of those matters."

⁵ See White House. Office of Homeland Security. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, p. 33, "Private firms bear primary and substantial responsibility for addressing the public (continued...)"

of intervening in those areas where owners and operators are unable (or unwilling) to provide what it, the federal government, may assess to be adequate protection or response.⁶

The reader who is not interested in the evolution of this policy and the organizational structures that have evolved to implement it can proceed to the **Policy Implementation** and/or **Issues** sections of this report.

The President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection

This report takes as its starting point the establishment of the President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection (PCCIP) in July 1996.⁷ Its tasks were to: report to the President the scope and nature of the vulnerabilities and threats to the nation's critical infrastructures (focusing primarily on cyber threats);⁸ recommend a comprehensive national policy and implementation plan for protecting critical infrastructures; determine legal and policy issues raised by proposals to increase protections; and propose statutory and regulatory changes necessary to effect recommendations.

The PCCIP released its report to President Clinton in October 1997.⁹ Examining both the physical and cyber vulnerabilities, the Commission found no immediate crisis threatening the nation's infrastructures. However, it did find reason to take action, especially in the area of cyber security. The rapid growth of a computer-literate population (implying a greater pool of potential hackers), the inherent vulnerabilities of common protocols in computer networks, the easy availability of hacker "tools" (available on many websites), and the fact that the basic tools of the hacker (computer, modem, telephone line) are the same essential technologies used by the general population indicated to the Commission that both threat and vulnerability exist.

⁵ (...continued)
safety risks posed by their industries...."

⁶ Op. Cit., p. 33, "The plan will describe how to use all available policy instruments to raise the security of America's critical infrastructure and key assets to a prudent level....In some cases the Department may seek legislation to create incentives for the private sector to adopt security measures.... In some cases, the federal government will need to rely on regulation."

⁷ Executive Order 13010. Critical Infrastructure Protection. Federal Register. Vol. 61, No. 138. July 17, 1996. pp. 3747-3750. Concern about the security of the nation's information infrastructure and the nation's dependence on it preceded the establishment of the Commission.

⁸ Given the growing dependence and interconnectedness of the nation's infrastructure on computer networks, there was concern that computers and computer networks presented a new vulnerability and one that was not receiving adequate attention.

⁹ President's Commission on Critical Infrastructure Protection, *Critical Foundations: Protecting America's Infrastructures*, October 1997.

The Commission generally recommended that greater cooperation and communication between the private sector and government was needed. The private sector owns and operates much of the nation's critical infrastructure. As seen by the Commission, the government's primary role (aside from protecting its own infrastructures) is to collect and disseminate the latest information on intrusion techniques, threat analysis, and ways to defend against hackers.

The Commission also proposed a strategy for action:

- facilitate greater cooperation and communication between the private sector and appropriate government agencies by: setting a top level policy-making office in the White House; establishing a council that includes corporate executives, state and local government officials, and cabinet secretaries; and setting up information clearinghouses;
- develop a real-time capability of attack warning;
- establish and promote a comprehensive awareness and education program;
- streamline and clarify elements of the legal structure to support assurance measures (including clearing jurisdictional barriers to pursuing hackers electronically); and,
- expand research and development in technologies and techniques, especially technologies that allow for greater detection of intrusions.

The Commission's report underwent interagency review to determine how to respond. That review led to a Presidential Decision Directive released in May 1998.

Presidential Decision Directive No. 63

Presidential Decision Directive No. 63 (PDD-63)¹⁰ set as a national goal the ability to protect the nation's critical infrastructure from intentional attacks (both physical and cyber) by the year 2003. According to the PDD, any interruptions in the ability of these infrastructures to provide their goods and services must be "brief, infrequent, manageable, geographically isolated, and minimally detrimental to the welfare of the United States."¹¹

PDD-63 identified the following activities whose critical infrastructures should be protected: information and communications; banking and finance; water supply; aviation, highways, mass transit, pipelines, rail, and waterborne commerce; emergency and law enforcement services; emergency, fire, and continuity of government services; public health services; electric power, oil and gas production, and storage. In addition, the PDD identified four activities where the federal government controls the critical infrastructure: internal security and federal law enforcement; foreign intelligence; foreign affairs; and national defense.

¹⁰ See *The Clinton's Administration's Policy on Critical Infrastructure Protection: Presidential Decision Directive 63*, White Paper, May 22, 1998. Available at the Federation of American Scientists website: [<http://www.fas.org/irp/offdocs/pdd/pdd-63.htm>].

¹¹ Ibid.

A lead agency was assigned to each of these “sectors” (see **Table 1**). Each lead agency was directed to appoint a **Sector Liaison Official** to interact with appropriate private sector organizations. The private sector was encouraged to select a **Sector Coordinator** to work with the agency’s sector liaison official. Together, the liaison official, sector coordinator, and all affected parties were to contribute to a sectoral security plan which was to be integrated into a **National Infrastructure Assurance Plan**. Each of the activities performed primarily by the federal government also were assigned a lead agency who was to appoint a **Functional Coordinator** to coordinate efforts similar to those made by the Sector Liaisons.

The PDD also assigned duties to the **National Coordinator** for Security, Infrastructure Protection, and Counter-terrorism.¹² The National Coordinator reported to the President through the Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.¹³ Among his many duties outlined in PDD-63, the National Coordinator

Table 1. Lead Agencies per PDD-63

Department/Agency	Sector/Function
Commerce	Information and Communications
Treasury	Banking and Finance
EPA	Water
Transportation	Transportation
Justice	Emergency Law Enforcement
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Emergency Fire Service
Health and Human Services	Emergency Medicine
Energy	Electric Power, Gas, and Oil
Justice	**Law Enforcement and Internal Security
Director of Central Intelligence	**Intelligence
State	**Foreign Affairs
Defense	**National Defense

** These are the functions identified by PDD-63 as being primarily under federal control.

chaired the **Critical Infrastructure Coordination Group**. This Group was the primary interagency working group for developing and implementing policy and for coordinating the federal government’s own internal security measures. The Group

¹² The National Coordinator position was created by Presidential Decision Directive 62, “Combating Terrorism.” PDD-62, which was classified, codified and clarified the roles and missions of various agencies engaged in counter-terrorism activities. The Office of the National Coordinator was established to integrate and coordinate these activities. The White House released a fact sheet on PDD-62 on May 22, 1998.

¹³ President Clinton designated Richard Clarke (Special Assistant to the President for Global Affairs, National Security Council) as National Coordinator.

included high level representatives from the lead agencies (including the Sector Liaisons), the National Economic Council, and all other relevant agencies.

Each federal agency was made responsible for securing its own critical infrastructure and was to designate a Critical Infrastructure Assurance Officer (CIAO) to assume that responsibility. The agency's current Chief Information Officer (CIO) could double in that capacity. In those cases where the CIO and the CIAO were different, the CIO was responsible for assuring the agency's information assets (databases, software, computers), while the CIAO was responsible for any other assets that make up that agency's critical infrastructure. Agencies were given 180 days from the signing of the Directive to develop their plans. Those plans were to be fully implemented within two years and updated every two years.

The PDD set up a **National Infrastructure Assurance Council**. The Council was to be a panel that included private operators of infrastructure assets and officials from state and local government officials and relevant federal agencies. The Council was to meet periodically and provide reports to the President as appropriate. The National Coordinator was to act as the Executive Director of the Council.

The PDD also called for a **National Infrastructure Assurance Plan**. The Plan was to integrate the plans from each of the sectors mentioned above and should consider the following: a vulnerability assessment, including the minimum essential capability required of the sector's infrastructure to meet its purpose; remedial plans to reduce the sector's vulnerability; warning requirements and procedures; response strategies; reconstitution of services; education and awareness programs; research and development needs; intelligence strategies; needs and opportunities for international cooperation; and legislative and budgetary requirements.

The PDD also set up a National Plan Coordination Staff to support the plan's development. Subsequently, the **Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office** (CIAO, not to be confused with the agencies' Critical Infrastructure Assurance Officers) was established to serve this function and was placed in the Department of Commerce's Export Administration. CIAO supported the National Coordinator's efforts to integrate the sectoral plans into a National Plan, supported individual agencies in developing their internal plans, helped coordinate national education and awareness programs, and provided legislative and public affairs support. Coordinating the development of and maintaining the National Plan is now part of the Department of Homeland Security Critical Infrastructure Outreach and Partnership program.

Most of the Directive established policy-making and oversight bodies making use of existing agency authorities and expertise. However, the PDD also addressed operational concerns. These dealt primarily with cyber security. The Directive called for a national capability to detect and respond to cyber attacks while they are in progress. Although not specifically identified in the Directive, the Clinton Administration proposed establishing a **Federal Intrusion Detection Network (FIDNET)** that would, together with the **Federal Computer Intrusion Response**

Capability (FedCIRC), established just prior to PDD-63, meet this goal.¹⁴ The Directive explicitly gave the Federal Bureau of Investigation the authority to expand its existing computer crime capabilities into a **National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC)**. The Directive called for the NIPC to be the focal point for federal threat assessment, vulnerability analysis, early warning capability, law enforcement investigations, and response coordination. All agencies were required to forward to the NIPC information about threats and actual attacks on their infrastructure as well as attacks made on private sector infrastructures of which they become aware. Presumably, FIDNET¹⁵ and FedCIRC would feed into the NIPC. According to the Directive, the NIPC would be linked electronically to the rest of the federal government and use warning and response expertise located throughout the federal government. The Directive also made the NIPC the conduit for information sharing with the private sector through an equivalent **Information Sharing and Analysis Center(s)** operated by the private sector, which PDD-63 encouraged the private sector to establish. Later, many of these functions were transferred to the Department of Homeland Security. The **U.S. Computer Emergency Response Team (U.S. CERT)** and the **National Operations Center (NOC)**, discussed later in this report, perform similar tasks today.

While the FBI was given the lead, the NIPC also included the Department of Defense, the Intelligence Community, and a representative from all lead agencies. Depending on the level of threat or the character of the intrusion, the NIPC was to have been placed in direct support of either the Department of Defense or the Intelligence Community.

Quite independent of PDD-63 in its origin, but clearly complimentary in its purpose, the FBI offers a program called **INFRAGARD** to private sector firms. The program includes an Alert Network. Participants in the program agree to supply the FBI with two reports when they suspect an intrusion of their systems has occurred. One report is “sanitized” of sensitive information and the other provides more detailed description of the intrusion. The FBI will help the participant respond to the intrusion. In addition, all participants are sent periodic updates on what is known about recent intrusion techniques. The FBI has set up local INFRAGARD chapters that can work with each other and regional FBI field offices. In January, 2001, the FBI announced it had finished establishing INFRAGARD chapters in each of its 56 field offices. Rather than sector-oriented, INFRAGARD is geographically-oriented. The national program was transferred to the NIPC, before it was absorbed by the Department of Homeland Security. The program is now managed by the FBI’s Cyber

¹⁴ FedCIRC was renamed the Federal Computer Incident Response Center and has since been absorbed into the Department of Homeland Security’s National Cyber Security Division.

¹⁵ From the beginning FIDNET generated controversy both inside and outside the government. Privacy concerns, cost and technical feasibility were at issue. By the end of the Clinton Administration, FIDNET as a distributed intrusion detection system feeding into a centralized analysis and warning capability was abandoned. Each agency, however, is allowed and encouraged to use intrusion detection technology to monitor and secure their own systems.

Division and is concerned with both cyber and physical threats to critical infrastructure.

It should also be noted that the FBI had, since the 1980s, a program called the **Key Assets Initiative (KAI)**. The objective of the KAI was to develop a database of information on “key assets” within the jurisdiction of each FBI field office, establish lines of communications with asset owners and operators to improve physical and cyber protection, and to coordinate with other federal, state, and local authorities to ensure their involvement in the protection of those assets. The program was initially begun to allow for contingency planning against physical terrorist attacks. According to testimony by a former Director of the NIPC, the program was “reinvigorated” by the NIPC and expanded to include the cyber dimension.¹⁶ The Department of Homeland Security is now responsible for creating a data base of critical assets.

Restructuring by the Bush Administration

Pre-September 11. As part of its overall redesign of White House organization and assignment of responsibilities, the in-coming Bush Administration spent the first eight months reviewing its options for coordinating and overseeing critical infrastructure protection. During this time, the Bush Administration continued to support the activities begun by the Clinton Administration.

The Bush Administration review was influenced by three parallel debates. First, the National Security Council (NSC) underwent a major streamlining. All groups within the Council established during previous Administrations were abolished. Their responsibilities and functions were consolidated into 17 Policy Coordination Committees (PCCs). The activities associated with critical infrastructure protection were assumed by the Counter-Terrorism and National Preparedness PCC. At the time, whether, or to what extent, the NSC should remain the focal point for coordinating critical infrastructure protection (i.e. the National Coordinator came from the NSC) was unclear. Richard Clarke, himself, wrote a memorandum to the incoming Bush Administration advocating that the function should be transferred directly to the White House.¹⁷

Second, there was a continuing debate about the merits of establishing a government-wide Chief Information Officer (CIO), whose responsibilities would include protection of all federal non-national security-related computer systems and coordination with the private sector on the protection of privately owned computer systems. Shortly after assuming office, the Bush Administration announced its desire not to create a separate federal CIO position, but to recruit a Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget that would assume an oversight role of agency

¹⁶ Testimony by Michael Vatis before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee on Technology and Terrorism. Oct. 6, 1999. This effort was transferred to the Department of Homeland Security.

¹⁷ Senior NSC Official Pitches Cyber-Security Czar Concept in Memo to Rice. *Inside the Pentagon*. Jan. 11, 2001. p. 2-3.

CIOs. One of the reasons cited for this was a desire to keep agencies responsible for their own computer security.¹⁸

Third, there was the continuing debate about how best to defend the country against terrorism, in general. The U.S. Commission on National Security/21st Century (the Hart-Rudman Commission) proposed a new National Homeland Security Agency. The recommendation built upon the current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) by adding to it the Coast Guard, the Border Patrol, Customs Service, and other agencies. The Commission recommended that the new organization include a directorate responsible for critical infrastructure protection. While both the Clinton and Bush Administration remained cool to this idea, bills were introduced in Congress to establish such an agency. As discussed below, the Bush Administration changed its position in June 2002, and proposed a new department along the lines of that proposed by the Hart/Rudman Commission and Congress.

Post-September 11. Soon after the September 11 terrorist attacks, President Bush signed two Executive Orders relevant to critical infrastructure protection. These have since been amended to reflect changes brought about by the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security (see below). The following is a brief discussion of the original E.O.s and how they have changed.

E.O. 13228, signed October 8, 2001 established the **Office of Homeland Security**, headed by the **Assistant to the President for Homeland Security**.¹⁹ Its mission is to “develop and coordinate the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats and attacks.” Among its functions is the coordination of efforts to protect the United States and its critical infrastructure from the consequences of terrorist attacks. This includes strengthening measures for protecting energy production, transmission, and distribution; telecommunications; public and privately owned information systems; transportation systems; and, the provision of food and water for human use. Another function of the Office is to coordinate efforts to ensure rapid restoration of these critical infrastructures after a disruption by a terrorist threat or attack.

The EO also established the **Homeland Security Council**. The Council is made up of the President, Vice-President, Secretaries of Treasury, Defense, Health and Human Services, and Transportation, the Attorney General, the Directors of FEMA, FBI, and CIA and the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security. The EO was later amended to add the Secretary of Homeland Security. Other White House and departmental officials can be invited to attend Council meetings.²⁰ The Council advises and assists the President with respect to all aspects of homeland security.

¹⁸ For a discussion of the debate surrounding this issue at the time, see CRS Report RL30914, *Federal Chief Information Officer (CIO): Opportunities and Challenges*, by Jeffery Seifert.

¹⁹ President Bush selected Tom Ridge to head the new Office.

²⁰ For more information on the structure of the Homeland Security Council and the Office of Homeland Security, see CRS Report RL31148, *Homeland Security: The Presidential Coordination Office*, by Harold Relyea.

The agenda for those meetings shall be set by the Assistant to President for Homeland Security, at the direction of the President. The Assistant is also the official recorder of Council actions and Presidential decisions.

In January and February 2003, this E.O. was amended (by Executive Orders 13284 and 13286, respectively). The Office of Homeland Security, the Assistant to the President, and the Homeland Security Council were all retained. However, the Secretary of Homeland Security was added to the Council. The duties of the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security remain the same, recognizing the statutory duties assigned to the Secretary of Homeland Security as a result of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (see below).

The second Executive Order (E.O. 13231) signed October 16, 2001, stated that it is U.S. policy “to protect against the disruption of the operation of information systems for critical infrastructure...and to ensure that any disruptions that occur are infrequent, of minimal duration, and manageable, and cause the least damage possible.”²¹ This Order also established the **President’s Critical Infrastructure Protection Board**. The Board, consisting of federal officials, was authorized to “recommend policies and coordinate programs for protecting information systems for critical infrastructure...” The Board also was directed to propose a National Plan on issues within its purview on a periodic basis, and, in coordination with the Office of Homeland Security, review and make recommendations on that part of agency budgets that fall within the purview of the Board.

The Board was chaired by a **Special Advisor to the President for Cyberspace Security**.²² The Special Advisor reported to both the Assistant to the President for National Security and the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security. Besides presiding over Board meetings, the Special Advisor, in consultation with the Board, was to propose policies and programs to appropriate officials to ensure protection of the nation’s information infrastructure and to coordinate with the Director of OMB on issues relating to budgets and the security of computer networks.

The Order also established the **National Infrastructure Advisory Council**. The Council is to provide advice to the President on the security of information systems for critical infrastructure. The Council’s functions include enhancing public-private partnerships, monitoring the development of ISACs, and encouraging the private sector to perform periodic vulnerability assessments of critical information and telecommunication systems.

Subsequent amendments to this E.O. (by E.O. 13286) abolished the President’s Board and the position of Special Advisor. The Advisory Council was retained, but now reports to the President through the Secretary of Homeland Security.

In July 2002, the Office of Homeland Security released a *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. The Strategy covered all government efforts to protect the

²¹ Executive Order 13231 — Critical Infrastructure Protection in the Information Age. Federal Register. Vol. 86. No. 202. Oct. 18, 2001.

²² President Bush designated Richard Clarke.

nation against terrorist attacks of all kinds. It identified protecting the nation's critical infrastructures and key assets (a new term, different as implied above by the FBI's key asset program) as one of six critical mission areas. The Strategy expanded upon the list of sectors considered to possess critical infrastructure to include public health, the chemical industry and hazardous materials, postal and shipping, the defense industrial base, and agriculture and food. The *Strategy* also added continuity of government and continuity of operations to the list, although it is difficult to see how the latter would be a considered sector. It also combined emergency fire service, emergency law enforcement, and emergency medicine as emergency services. And, it dropped those functions that primarily belonged to the federal governments (e.g. defense, intelligence, law enforcement). It also reassigned some of the sectors to different agencies, including making the then proposed Department of Homeland Security lead agency for a number of sectors — postal and shipping services, and the defense industrial base. It also introduced a new class of assets, called key assets, which was defined as potential targets whose destruction may not endanger vital systems, but could create a local disaster or profoundly affect national morale. Such assets were defined later to include national monuments and other historic attractions, dams, nuclear facilities, and large commercial centers, including office buildings and sport stadiums, where large numbers of people congregate to conduct business, personal transactions, or enjoy recreational activities.²³

The Strategy reiterated many of the same policy-related activities as mentioned above: working with the private sector and other non-federal entities, naming those agencies that should act as liaison with the private sector, assessing vulnerabilities, and developing a national plan to deal with those vulnerabilities. The Strategy also mentioned the need to set priorities, acknowledging that not all assets are equally critical, and that the costs associated with protecting assets must be balanced against the benefits of increased security according to the threat. The Strategy did not create any new organizations, but assumed that a Department of Homeland Security would be established (see below).

On December 17, 2003, the Bush Administration released **Homeland Security Presidential Directive 7 (HSPD-7)**. HSPD essentially updated the policy of the United States and the roles and responsibilities of various agencies in regard to critical infrastructure protection as outlined in previous documents, national strategies, and the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (see below). For example, the Directive reiterated the Secretary of Homeland Security's role in coordinating the overall national effort to protect critical infrastructure. It also reiterated the role of Sector-Specific Agencies (i.e. Lead Agencies)²⁴ to work with their sectors to identify, prioritize, and coordinate protective measures. The Directive captured the expanded set of critical infrastructures and key assets and Sector-Specific Agencies assignments made in the *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. The Directive also reiterated the relationship between the Department of Homeland Security and other agencies in certain areas. For example, while the Department of Homeland

²³ The White House, *The National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets*. February 2003. p. 71.

²⁴ This report will continue to use the term "Lead Agency" to refer to the agency assigned to work with a specific sector.

Security will maintain a cyber security unit, the Directive stated that the Director of the Office of Management remains responsible for overseeing government-wide information security programs and for ensuring the operation of a federal cyber incident response center within the Department of Homeland Security. Also, while the Department of Homeland Security is responsible for transportation security, including airline security, the Department of Transportation remains responsible for control of the national air space system.

The only organizational change made by the Directive was the establishment of the **Critical Infrastructure Protection Policy Coordinating Committee** which will advise the Homeland Security Council on interagency policy related to physical and cyber infrastructure security.

The Directive made a few other noticeable changes or additions. For example, the Department of Homeland Security was assigned as Lead Agency for the chemical and hazardous materials sector (it had been the Environmental Protection Agency). The Directive required Lead Agencies to report annually to the Secretary of Homeland Security on their efforts in working with the private sector. The Directive also reiterated that all federal agencies must develop plans to protect their own critical infrastructure and submit those plans for approval to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget by July 2004.

The Bush Administration policy and approach regarding critical infrastructure protection can be described as an evolutionary expansion of the policies and approaches laid out in PDD-63. The fundamental policy statements are essentially the same: the protection of infrastructures critical to the people, economy, essential government services, and national security. National morale was added to that list. Also, the stated goal of the government's efforts is to ensure that any disruption of the services provided by these infrastructures be infrequent, of minimal duration, and manageable. The infrastructures identified as critical were essentially the same (although expanded and with an emphasis placed on targets that would result in large numbers of casualties). Finally, the primary effort is directed at working collaboratively and voluntarily with the private sector owners and operators of critical infrastructure to identify critical assets and provide appropriate protection.

Organizationally, there remains an interagency group for coordinating policy across departments and for informing the White House (Homeland Security Council, supported by the Critical Infrastructure Protection Coordinating Committee). Certain agencies have been assigned certain sectors with which to work. Sectors are asked to organize themselves to assist in coordination of effort and information sharing. A Council made up of private sector executives, academics, and State and local officials was established to advise the President. Certain operational units (e.g., the Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office (CIAO) and elements of the National Infrastructure Protection Center (at the FBI)) were initially left in place, though later moved to and restructured within the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), where the Undersecretary of Preparedness is responsible for coordinating the implementation of policies and programs (see below). However, DHS takes a much more active role in identifying critical assets, assessing vulnerabilities, and recommending and supporting protective measures than did these earlier operational

units. Also, the manpower and resources devoted to these activities have greatly increased.

One major difference between PDD-63 and the current Administration's efforts is a shift in focus. PDD-63 focused on cybersecurity. While the post-September 11 effort is still concerned with cybersecurity, its focus on physical threats, especially those that might cause mass casualties, is greater than the pre-September 11 effort. This led to some debate and organizational instability initially. The early executive orders discussed above segregated cyber security from the physical security mission with the formation of the Office of Homeland Security and the President's Critical Infrastructure Protection Board. Dissolution of the Board and the subsequent establishment of the Critical Infrastructure Protection Policy Coordinating Committee, responsible for advising the Homeland Security Council on both physical and cyber security issues, would appear to reunite these two concerns within a single White House group.²⁵

Department of Homeland Security

Initial Establishment. In November 2002, Congress passed the Homeland Security Act (P.L. 107-296), establishing a **Department of Homeland Security (DHS)**. The act assigned to the new Department the mission of preventing terrorist attacks, reducing the vulnerability of the nation to such attacks, and responding rapidly should such an attack occur. The act essentially consolidated within one department a number of agencies that had, as part of their missions, homeland security-like functions (e.g., Border Patrol, Customs, Transportation Security Administration). The following discussion focuses on those provisions relating to critical infrastructure protection.

In regard to critical infrastructure protection the act transferred the following agencies and offices to the new department: the NIPC (except for the Computer Investigations and Operations Section), CIAO, FedCIRC, the **National Simulation and Analysis Center (NISAC)**,²⁶ other energy security and assurance activities within DOE, and the **National Communication System (NCS)**.²⁷ These agencies

²⁵ Computer security advocates have sought to highlight cyber security issues by maintaining a separate organization high within the bureaucracy. There now exists both an Assistant Secretary for Cyber Security and Telecommunications and an Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection, both reporting to the Undersecretary for Preparedness. While the latter is concerned with both physical and cyber security issues, the former is focused on cyber security issues.

²⁶ The NISAC was established in the USA PATRIOT Act (P.L. 107-56), Section 1062. The Center builds upon expertise at Sandia National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory in modeling and simulating infrastructures and the interdependencies between them.

²⁷ The NCS is not a single communication system but more a capability that ensures that disparate government agencies can communicate with each other in times of emergencies. To make sure this capability exists and to assure that it is available when needed, an interagency group meets regularly to discuss issues and solve problems. The NCS was

(continued...)

and offices were integrated within the **Directorate of Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IA/IP)** (one of four operational Directorates established by the act).²⁸ Notably, the Transportation Security Administration (TSA), which is responsible for securing all modes of the nation's transportation system, was not made part of this Directorate (it was placed within the Border and Transportation Security Directorate); nor was the Coast Guard, which is responsible for port security. The act assigned the rank of Undersecretary to the head of each Directorate. Furthermore, the act designated that within the Directorate of Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, there were to be both an Assistant Secretary for Information Analysis, and an **Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection**.

Among the responsibilities assigned the IA/IP Directorate were:

- to access, receive, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources in order to identify and assess the nature and scope of the terrorist threat;
- to carry out comprehensive **assessments of the vulnerabilities** of key resources and critical infrastructure of the United States, including **risk assessments** to determine risks posed by particular types of attacks;
- to integrate relevant information, analyses, and vulnerability assessments in order to **identify priorities for protective and support measures**;
- to develop a comprehensive national plan for securing key resources and critical infrastructures;
- to administer the Homeland Security Advisory System;
- to work with the intelligence community to establish collection priorities; and,
- to establish a secure communication system for receiving and disseminating information.

In addition, the act provided a number of protections for certain information (defined as critical infrastructure information) that non-federal entities, especially private firms or ISACs formed by the private sector, voluntarily provide the Department. Those protections included exempting it from the Freedom of Information Act, precluding the information from being used in any civil action,

²⁷ (...continued)

initially established in 1963 by the Kennedy Administration to ensure communications between military, diplomatic, intelligence, and civilian leaders, following the Cuban Missile Crisis. Those activities were expanded by the Reagan Administration to include emergency preparedness and response, including natural disaster response. The current interagency group includes 23 departments and agencies. The private sector, which own a significant share of the assets needed to ensure the necessary connectivity, is involved through the **National Security Telecommunication Advisory Committee (NSTAC)**. The National Coordinating Center, mentioned later in this report, and which serves as the telecommunications ISAC, is an operational entity within the NCS.

²⁸ The other operational directorates included **Science and Technology**, **Border and Transportation Security** and **Emergency Preparedness and Response**.

exempting it from any agency rules regarding ex parte communication, and exempting it from requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

The act basically built upon existing policy and activities. Many of the policies, objectives, missions, and responsibilities complement those already established (e.g., vulnerability assessments, national planning, communication between government and private sector, and improving protections).

Chertoff Reorganization. Secretary Chertoff (the second Secretary of Homeland Security), as one of his Second Stage Review recommendations, proposed restructuring the IA/IP Directorate and renaming it the **Directorate of Preparedness**. The IA function was merged into a new **Office of Intelligence and Analysis**. The IP function, with the same missions as outlined in the Homeland Security Act, remained, but was joined by other existing and new entities. The renamed Directorate included elements from Office of State and Local Government Coordination and Preparedness, including its principal grant-making functions and some of the preparedness functions of the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). A new position of Chief Medical Officer was created within the Directorate and the U.S. Fire Administration and the Office of National Capital Region Coordination were transferred into the Directorate. In addition, the restructuring called for an Assistant Secretary for Cyber Security and Telecommunications (a position long sought by many within the cyber security community) and an Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protection.

According to the DHS press release, the mission of the restructured Directorate was to “facilitate grants and over see nationwide preparedness efforts supporting first responder training, citizen awareness, public health, infrastructure and cyber security, and [to] ensure proper steps are taken to protect high-risk targets.”

Other recommendations resulting from the review that may impact infrastructure protection included moving the Homeland Security Operations Center, now called the National Operations Center, out of the old IA/IP Directorate and placing it within a new Office of Operations Coordination; and, a new Directorate of Policy, which is described as serving as the primary Department-wide coordinator of policies, regulations, and other initiatives. The conference committee report on the Department’s FY2006 appropriations (H.Rept. 109-241) approved these changes.

Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006. The Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006 is Title VI of the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2007 (P.L. 109-295). This act relocates the Federal Emergency Management Agency within the Department of Homeland Security and explicitly preserves it as a distinct entity within the Department. While a full discussion of this reorganization and its implications is beyond the scope of this report, it should be noted that the grant making functions previously merged with the critical infrastructure protection activities of the Preparedness Directorate were transferred with the Agency. The critical infrastructure protection activities associated with the Assistant Secretary of Infrastructure Protection and the Assistant

Secretary for Cyber Security and Telecommunications remain in the Preparedness Directorate.²⁹

Policy Implementation

Government - Sector Coordination. The number and breakdown of sectors and lead, or sector specific agencies, have expanded and changed since the assignments made by PDD-63 (and noted in **Table 1** of this report). As mentioned above, the Bush Administration has expanded the number of sectors considered to possess critical infrastructure and made some changes in assignments. **Table 2**, below, shows the current list of sectors and their lead agencies, as defined in the National Infrastructure Protection Plan released June 2006.

Table 2. Current Lead Agency Assignments

Department/Agency	Sector/Subsector
Agriculture	Agriculture
	Food
Agriculture	Meat/Poultry
Health and Human Services	All other
Treasury	Banking and Finance
EPA	Drinking Water and Water Treatment Systems
Health and Human Services	Public Health and Healthcare
Defense	Defense Industrial Base
Interior	National Monuments and Icons
Energy	Energy ¹
Homeland Security	Transportation Systems ²
Homeland Security	Postal and Shipping
Homeland Security	Information Technology
Homeland Security	Communications
Homeland Security	Commercial Nuclear Reactors, Materials, and Waste
Homeland Security	Chemical
Homeland Security	Emergency Services
Homeland Security	Dams
Homeland Security	Commercial Facilities
Homeland Security	Government Facilities

1. While noted here as a single sector, in practice it is represented by two relatively separate sectors: electric power (except for nuclear power facilities); and the production, refining,

²⁹ These activities form the Infrastructure Protection and Information Security Program.

and some distribution of oil and gas. The Department of Energy is the lead agency for both. However, the Department of Homeland Security (through the Transportation Security Administration) is the lead agency for the distribution of oil and gas via pipelines. Nuclear power is considered its own sector.

2. While noted here as a single sector, Transportation includes all modes of transportation: rail, mass transit (rail and bus), air, maritime, highways, pipelines, etc. The Transportation Security Administration within the Department of Homeland Security, in collaboration with the Department of Transportation, is the lead agency for all but the maritime subsector, for which the Coast Guard, also within the Department of Homeland Security, acts as lead agency.

PDD-63 called for the selection, by each Lead Agency, of a Sector Liaison Official (representing the Lead Agency) and a Sector Coordinator (representing the owners/operators of each sector). While most agencies quickly identified their Sector Liaison Official, it took more time to identify Sector Coordinators. Different sectors present different challenges for coordination. Some sectors are more diverse than others (e.g., transportation includes rail, air, waterways, and highways; information and communications include computers, software, wire and wireless communications) and raise the issue of how to have all the relevant players represented. Other sectors are fragmented, consisting of small or local entities. Some sectors, such as banking, telecommunications, and energy have more experience than others in working with the federal government and/or working collectively to assure the performance of their systems.

In addition to such structural issues are ones related to competition. Inherent in the exercise is asking competitors to cooperate. In some cases it is asking competing industries to cooperate. This cooperation not only raises issues of trust among firms, but also concerns regarding anti-trust rules.

Over time, Sector Coordinators were selected for most of the sectors identified under PDD-63. Typically, a representative from a relevant trade organizations was chosen to act as sector coordinator. For example, the Environmental Protection Agency selected the Executive Director of the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies to act as Sector Coordinator for the water sector. In the case of the law enforcement sector (no longer identified as a separate sector), the National Infrastructure Protection Center helped create a Emergency Law Enforcement Services Forum, consisting of senior state, local, and non-FBI law enforcement officials. In the case of banking and finance, the Sector Coordinator was chosen from a major banking/finance institution, who doubled as the Chairperson of the Financial Services Sector Coordinating Council, an organization specifically set up by the industry to coordinate critical infrastructure protection activities with the federal government.

In December 1999, a number of the sectors formed a **Partnership for Critical Infrastructure Security** to share information and strategies and to identify interdependencies across sectoral lines. The Partnership was a private sector initiative. The federal government was not officially part of the Partnership, but the Department of Homeland Security (and CIAO before that) acted as a liaison and provided administrative support for meetings. Sector Liaisons from lead agencies were considered ex officio members. The Partnership helped coordinate its members

input to a number of the national strategies released to date and were to provide input into the National Plan called for in PDD-63.

While initially working with this organizational structure, the Bush Administration promoted a new Critical Infrastructure Protection Partnership Model. Resembling the Financial Services Sector Coordinating Council approach, this newer Model expanded the sector liaison and sector coordinator model of PDD-63 into **Government Coordinating Councils** and **Sector Coordinating Councils** for each sector. The primary objective was to expand both owner/operator and government representation within all sectors. Now, for example, the Water Sector Coordinating Council consists of two owner/operator representatives, along with one non-voting association staff, from each of the following participating organizations: the Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies, the American Water Works Association, the American Water Works Association Research Foundation, the National Association of Clean Water Agencies, the National Association of Water Companies, the National Rural Water Association, the Water Environment Federation, and the Water Environment Research Foundation. The Water Government Coordinating Council is chaired by the Environmental Protection Agency, the Lead Agency, but also includes the Department of Homeland Security, the Food and Drug Administration, the Department of Interior, and the Center for Disease Control. Government Coordinating Councils can also include state, local, and tribal government entities. The Sector Coordinating Councils are to establish their own organizational structures and leadership and act independently from the federal government. Also, under this model, the Partnership for Critical Infrastructure Security has been designated the **Private Sector Cross-Sector Council**. The Sector Coordinating Councils are to provide input into both the National Infrastructure Protection Plan and the individual Sector Specific Plans (see below). Many of the issues governing the progress made in identifying and working with the sector coordinators model of PDD-63 continue with the sector coordinating councils.³⁰

In March 2006, the Department of Homeland Security used its authority under the Homeland Security Act (P.L. 107-296, Section 871) — to form advisory committees that are exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (P.L. 92-463) — to establish the **Critical Infrastructure Partnership Advisory Council (CIPAC)**.³¹ The Federal Advisory Committee Act requires advisory committees generally to meet in open session and make written materials available to the public. The purpose of waiving this act for the CIPAC is to facilitate more open discussion between the sector coordinating councils and the government coordinating councils (if not with the public). DHS acts as the Executive Secretariat. Members include owner/operators that are members of their respective sector coordinating councils or belong to an association that is a member of the coordinating council. Members also include federal, state, local, and tribal government entities that belong to their respective government coordinating councils. While the CIPAC is exempt from the

³⁰ See, U.S. Congress. General Accountability Office. *Critical Infrastructure Protection: Progress Coordinating Government and Private Sector Efforts Varies by Sectors' Characteristics*. GAO-07-39. October 2006.

³¹ See, Federal Register. Vol. 71 No. 57. pp. 14930-14933. March 24, 2006.

Federal Advisory Committee Act, DHS stated in its public notice that it will make meeting dates and appropriate agendas available. There is a CIPAC webpage on the DHS website.³²

Appointment of the National Infrastructure Advisory Council. The Clinton Administration released an Executive Order (13130) in July, 1999, formally establishing the National Infrastructure Assurance Council. Just prior to leaving office, President Clinton put forward the names of 18 appointees.³³ The Order was rescinded by the Bush Administration before the Council could meet. In Executive Order 13231,³⁴ President Bush established a National Infrastructure Advisory Council (with the same acronym, NIAC) whose functions are similar to those of the Clinton Council. On September 18, 2002, President Bush announced his appointment of 24 individuals to serve on Council.³⁵ The E.O. amending 13231 makes some minor modifications to NIAC. Primarily, the Council now reports to the President through the Secretary of Homeland Security.³⁶

Internal Agency Plans. There had been some confusion about which agencies were required by PDD-63 to submit critical infrastructure plans. The Directive required every agency to develop and implement such a plan. A subsequent Informational Seminar on PDD-63 held on October 13, 1998 identified two tiers of agencies. The first tier included lead agencies and other “primary” agencies like the Central Intelligence Agency and Veteran’s Affairs. These agencies were held to the Directive’s 180 day deadline. A second tier of agencies were identified by the National Coordinator and required to submit plans by the end of February, 1999. The “secondary” agencies were Agriculture, Education, Housing and Urban Development, Labor, Interior, General Services Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. All of these “primary” and “secondary” agencies met their initial deadlines for submitting their internal plans for protecting their own critical infrastructures from attacks and for responding to intrusions. The Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office (CIAO) assembled an expert team to review the plans. The plans were assessed in 12 areas including schedule/milestone planning, resource requirements, and knowledge of existing authorities and guidance. The assessment team handed back the initial plans

³² See, [http://www.dhs.gov/xprevprot/committees/editorial_0843.shtm]. This site was last visited on November 13, 2006.

³³ White House Press Release, dated Jan. 18, 2000.

³⁴ Executive Order 13231 — Critical Infrastructure Protection in the Information Age. Federal Register. Vol. 66. No. 202. Oct. 18, 2001. pp. 53063-53071. The NIAC is established on page 53069.

³⁵ See White House Press Release, Sept. 18, 2002. Information on the Council’s membership and activities can be found on the Department’s website at [http://www.dhs.gov/xprevprot/committees/editorial_0353.shtm]. Site was last visited on November 21, 2006.

³⁶ The membership and activities of the National Infrastructure Advisory Council can be found on the DHS website. See, [http://www.dhs.gov/xprevprot/committees/editorial_0353.shtm]. Site was last visited on December 12, 2006.

with comments. Agencies were given 90 days to respond to these comments. Of the 22 “primary” and “secondary” agencies that submitted plans, 16 modified and resubmitted them in response to first round comments.

Initially, the process of reviewing agency plans was to continue until all concerns were addressed. Over the summer of 1999, however, review efforts slowed and subsequent reviews were put on hold as the efficacy of the reviews was debated. Some within the CIAO felt that the plans were too general and lacked a clear understanding of what constituted a “critical asset” and the interdependencies of those assets. As a result of that internal debate, the CIAO redirected its resources to institute a new program called **Project Matrix**. Project Matrix is a three step process by which an agency can identify and assess its most critical assets, identify the dependencies of those assets on other systems, including those beyond the direct control of the agency, and prioritize. CIAO offered this analysis to agencies, including some not designated as “primary” or “secondary” agencies, such as the Social Security Administration and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Participation by the agencies was voluntary.³⁷

In the meantime, other agencies (i.e. those not designated as primary or secondary) apparently did not develop critical infrastructure plans. In a much later report by the President’s Council on Integrity and Efficiency (dated March 21, 2001), the Council, which was charged with reviewing agencies’ implementation of PDD-63, stated that there was a misunderstanding as to the applicability of PDD-63 to all agencies. The Council asserted that all agencies were required to develop a critical infrastructure plan and that many had not, because they felt they were not covered by the Directive. Also, the Council found that of the agency plans that had been submitted, many were incomplete, had not identified their mission-critical assets, and that almost none had completed vulnerability assessments. Two years later, the Government Accountability Office³⁸ reported that four of the agencies they reviewed for the House Committee on Energy and Commerce (HHS, Energy, Commerce, and EPA) had still not yet identified their critical assets and operational dependencies, nor have they set any deadlines for doing so.³⁹

Interestingly, HSPD-7 reestablished a deadline for agencies to submit critical infrastructure protection plans to the Director of OMB for approval by July 2004. The Director of OMB provided guidance on how agencies should meet their requirement (Memorandum M-04-15, June 17, 2004). The memorandum stated that plans for the physical protection of assets would be subject to interagency review coordinated by the Department of Homeland Security, with DHS providing a written evaluation of each agency’s plans within 120 days. Agency cyber security plans would be reviewed by OMB, as part of the requirements associated with the Federal Information Security Management Act of 2002, included as Title III of E-

³⁷ The use of Project Matrix’s methodology continues under HSPD-7.

³⁸ Note: The General Accounting Office has had its name changed legislatively to the Government Accountability Office.

³⁹ U.S. Government Accountability Office, Critical Infrastructure Protection: Challenges for Selected Agencies and Industry Sectors. Report to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, House of Representatives. GAO-03-233. Feb. 2003. pp. 4-5.

Government Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-347). These plans are to provide information to be included in the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (see below). DHS and OMB have not been willing to provide CRS with the status of these reports.

National Critical Infrastructure Plan. PDD-63 called for a National Infrastructure Assurance Plan that would be informed by sector-level plans and would include an assessment of minimal operating requirements, vulnerabilities, remediation plans, reconstitution plans, warning requirements, etc. The National Strategy for Homeland Security, and the Homeland Security Act each have called for the development of a comprehensive national infrastructure protection plan, as well, although without specifying deadlines and what that plan should include. HSPD-7 called for a comprehensive National Plan for Critical Infrastructure and Key Resources Protection by the end of 2004. According to HSPD-7, the National Plan should include a) a strategy to identify, prioritize, and coordinate the protection of critical infrastructure and key resources, including how the Department will work with other stakeholders; b) a summary of activities to be undertaken in order to carry out the strategy; c) a summary of initiatives for sharing critical infrastructure information and threat warnings with other stakeholders; and d) coordination with other federal emergency management activities.

In January 2000, the Clinton Administration released Version 1.0 of a *National Plan for Information Systems Protection*.⁴⁰ In keeping with the original focus of PDD-63, the Plan focused primarily on cyber-related efforts within the federal government. The Bush Administration, through the President's Critical Infrastructure Protection Board, released *The National Strategy to Secure Cyberspace* in February 2003, which could be considered Version 2.0 of the Clinton-released Plan. It addressed all stakeholders in the nation's information infrastructure, from home users to the international community, and included input from the private sector, the academic community, and state and local governments. Also in February 2003, the Office of Homeland Security released *The National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets*. This strategy took a broad perspective of the issues and needs associated with organizing the nation's efforts to protect its critical infrastructure; identifying roles and responsibilities, actions that need to be taken, and guiding principles.

The Department of Homeland Security missed the December 2004 deadline for releasing the National Infrastructure Protection Plan called for in HSPD-7. It did publish an Interim National Infrastructure Protection Plan in February 2005. According to media reports, some in the private sector complained they were not adequately consulted.⁴¹ The Department subsequently released for public comment

⁴⁰ *Defending America's Cyberspace. National Plan for Information Systems Protection. Version 1.0. An Invitation to a Dialogue.* The White House. 2000.

⁴¹ See "Still Waiting: Plan to Protect Critical Infrastructure Overdue from DHS," Congressional Quarterly. Homeland Security-Transportation & Infrastructure Newsletter, Jan. 28, 2005. The Newsletter is electronic and available by subscription only. See, [<http://homeland.cq.com/hs/display.do?dockkey=/cqonline/prod/data/docs/html/hsnews/109/hsnews109-000001507251.html@allnews&metapub=HSNEWS&seqNum=827&search>] (continued...)

a “draft” National Infrastructure Protection Plan in November 2005.⁴² A final version of the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) was approved June 30, 2006.⁴³

The NIPP identifies and integrates specific processes by which an integrated national risk management effort can proceed. For example, it defines and seeks to standardize, across all sectors, the process for identifying and selecting assets for further analysis, identifying threats and conducting threat assessments, assessing vulnerabilities to those threats, analyzing consequences, determining risks, identifying potential risk mitigation activities, and prioritizing those activities based on cost-effectiveness.⁴⁴ The NIPP also calls for implementation plans for these risk reduction activities, with timelines and responsibilities identified, and tied to resources. Each lead agency is to work with its sector to generate Sector Specific Plans, utilizing the processes outlined in the NIPP. DHS will then use these same processes to integrate the sector specific plans into a national plan that identifies those assets and risk reduction plans that require national level attention because of the risk the incapacitation of those assets pose to the nation as a whole. According to the NIPP, Sector Specific Plans are due 180 days after release of the NIPP (that would mean they are due at the end of 2006). It is not clear from the NIPP when the cross-cutting national-level plan would be released. However, the first annual review of Sector Specific Plans and the NIPP is to be conducted one year after the NIPP’s release (i.e. in June 2007).

It should be noted, that some sectors and agencies have performed already some or all of these risk management steps using various techniques and processes. The NIPP requires that each sector and lead agency ensure that previous work meets the basic requirements associated with the processes described in the NIPP.

Distinguishing between a strategy and plan, and whether these documents yet fulfill the requirement for the comprehensive national plan called for in the Homeland Security Act, is beyond the scope of this report. However, each succeeding document does appear to refine further some goal, objective, or initiative discussed in preceding documents.

Information Sharing and Analysis Center (ISAC). PDD-63 envisaged a single ISAC to be the private sector counterpart to the FBI’s National Infrastructure Protection Center (NIPC), collecting, analyzing, and sharing incident and response information among its members and facilitating information exchange between government and the private sector. The idea of a single ISAC evolved into each

⁴¹ (...continued)
hIndex=1]. The article was last viewed on December 28, 2006.

⁴² See *Federal Register*, vol.70, no. 212, Nov. 3, 2005, pp. 66840-66841.

⁴³ The NIPP can be found at [http://www.dhs.gov/xprevprot/programs/editorial_0827.shtm]. This site was last visited on November 21, 2006.

⁴⁴ For a discussion of a basic risk management process in a critical infrastructure context, see CRS Report RL32561, *Risk Management and Critical Infrastructure Protection: Assessing, Integrating, and Managing Threats, Vulnerabilities, and Consequences*, by John Moteff.

sector having its own center. ISACs differ somewhat from sector coordinating function in that they were to be 24/7/365 operations, where incidents experienced by owner/operators, as well as threat information from the government, could be reported, analyzed, and shared. Many were conceived originally as concentrating on cyber security issues, and some still function with that emphasis. However, others have incorporated physical security into their missions.

ISACs were formed around two primary models. One model involved ISAC members legally incorporating and establishing either their own ISAC operations or contracting operations out to a security firm. The banking, information, water, oil and gas, railroad, and mass transit sectors followed this approach.

The other model involved utilizing an existing industry or government-industry coordinating group and adding critical infrastructure protection to the mission of that group. The electric power (which uses North American Electricity Reliability Council (NERC)) and the telecommunications sector (which uses the National Coordinating Center (NCC)) followed this model. The emergency fire services sector incorporated ISAC functions into the existing operations of the U.S. Fire Administration, which has interacted with local fire departments for years.

Different federal financial support models were developed for ISACs, too. In some cases, ISACs received start up funding from their Lead Agency (e.g., drinking water received funding from EPA). In some cases, that support continues, in some cases the support has not continued (e.g., DOE no longer supports the energy ISAC). Other ISACs have always been self-supporting. The individual ISACs have formed a group called the ISAC Council.⁴⁵ Their formation and function experience some of the same variation as the coordinating councils, for some of the same reasons.

While PDD-63 envisioned ISACs to be a primary conduit for exchanging critical infrastructure information between the federal government and specific sectors, the Department of Homeland Security has developed a number of other information sharing systems and mechanism. For example, **US-CERT** (the U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team) publishes information on the latest computer-related vulnerabilities and threats and information on how to respond to a specific incident. U.S.-CERT also accepts incidents reports. It also manages the **National Cyber Alert System**, to which any organization or individual can subscribe. The Department also has developed a **Homeland Security Information Network (HSIN)**. HSIN initially served as the primary communication network for communicating and analyzing threat information between government law enforcement agencies at the federal, state, and local levels. The HSIN is being expanded to include each critical infrastructure sector (dubbed HSIN-CI) as part of the Critical Infrastructure Protection Partnership Model (i.e. through each sector and government coordinating council).

Shortly after September 11, 2001, the Department established what is now called the Infrastructure Protection **Executive Notification Service (ENS)**, which

⁴⁵ See, [<http://www.isaccouncil.org/sites/index.php>]. This site was last visited on November 21, 2006.

connects DHS directly with the Chief Executive Officers of major industrial firms. The ENS is used to alert partners to infrastructure incidents, to disseminate warning products, and to conduct teleconferences. The Department is also responsible for operating the **Critical Infrastructure Warning Network (CWIN)**, which provides secure communications between DHS and other federal, state, and local agencies, the private sector, and international agencies. CWIN does not rely on the Public Switch Network or the internet.

Identifying Critical Assets, Assessing Vulnerability and Risk, and Prioritizing Protective Measures. Among the activities assigned to the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate by the Homeland Security Act of 2002 were:

- access, receive, analyze, and integrate information from a variety of sources in order to identify and assess the nature and scope of the terrorist threat;
- carry out comprehensive assessments of the vulnerabilities of key resources and critical infrastructure, of the United States including risk assessments to determine risks posed by particular types of attacks;
- integrate relevant information, analyses, and vulnerability assessments in order to identify priorities for protective and support measures.

Furthermore, according to the National Strategy for the Physical Protection of Critical Infrastructures and Key Assets, the Department of Homeland Security: a) “in collaboration with other key stakeholders, will develop a uniform methodology for identifying facilities, systems, and functions with national-level criticality to help establish protection priorities;” b) “will build a comprehensive database to catalog these critical facilities, systems, and functions;” and c) “will also maintain a comprehensive, up-to-date assessment of vulnerabilities and preparedness across critical sectors.” Furthermore, these efforts “will help guide near-term protective actions and provide a basis for long-term leadership focus and informed resource investment.”

Following September 11, 2001, owners/operators of critical infrastructure assets, to varying degrees, began identifying critical assets, assessing their vulnerabilities to attack, and developed security plans or beefed up protections. For example, the Federal Transit Authority assessed the vulnerabilities of the nation’s largest mass transit systems. The freight rail companies developed additional security measures to coincide with the level of threat identified by DHS’s color-coded National Alert System. Drinking water authorities, through the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Act (P.L. 107-188), were required to conduct vulnerability assessments and to develop security plans based on those assessments. Port facilities and maritime vessels were required by the Maritime Transportation Security Act (P.L. 107-295) to do the same. The American Petroleum Institute, the North American Electric Reliability Council, and other industry associations offered guidance to their respective members on how to conduct vulnerability assessments and to manage their risk from possible attack. However, DHS’s ability to coordinate this activity developed more slowly, and its ability to develop a uniform methodology

that would allow it to generate a set of national priorities is unfolding just now with the release of its NIPP, described above.

However, during this same time, DHS has engaged in at least two other sets of activities that have, also to varying degrees, identified critical assets, assessed their vulnerabilities, and provided assistance to increase protection of these sites.

Shortly before the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2003, as part of Operation Liberty Shield⁴⁶, what was then called the Protective Services Division of the newly-formed Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate, identified a list of 160 assets or sites, including chemical and hazardous materials sites, nuclear power plants, energy facilities, business and finance centers, and more, that it considered critical to the nation based on their vulnerability to attack and potential consequences. During the course of the year, that list grew to 1,849 assets or sites.⁴⁷

According to testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on April 1, 2004, then-Undersecretary for Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection, Frank Libutti, made reference to 1700 sites identified by DHS as being high priority sites.⁴⁸ According to the testimony, DHS intended to visit each of these sites to assess their vulnerabilities to various forms of attack and to meet with local law enforcement officials to assist them in developing **Buffer Zone Protection Plans (BZPPs)**. BZPPs focus on protections that can be taken “outside the fence,” including how to identify threatening surveillance, patrolling techniques, and how to assert command and control if an incident should occur. DHS has provided training and technical assistance to help state and local law enforcement entities develop their own BZPPs. The BZPP activity is now integrated into the State and Local Grants Program. In addition to these “outside the fence” activities, DHS has conducted **Site Assistance Visits (SAVs)** at selected sites, on a voluntary basis, to discuss with owners and operators vulnerabilities and protective measures that can be taken “inside the fence.” SAVs form an integral part of the “**comprehensive reviews (CRs)**” DHS is performing on both nuclear power facilities and high-priority chemical facilities. Once these two sectors are completed, DHS is planning to conduct comprehensive reviews of other sectors.

In addition to its selection of high priority sites and subsequent site visits, vulnerability assessments, and buffer zone protection plans, DHS also has been supporting infrastructure protection at the state and local level through its State and Local Grant Programs. Specific grant programs include the State Homeland Security Formula-based Grants, the High Threat and the High Density Urban Area Grants (both of which primarily support first responder needs, but include certain

⁴⁶ Operation Liberty Shield was a comprehensive national plan to protect the homeland during operations in Iraq.

⁴⁷ See, Department of Homeland Security. Office of the Inspector General. *Progress in Developing the National Asset Database*. OIG-06-04. June 2006.

⁴⁸ According to the Department’s Inspector General report, these 1,700 assets refer to the 1,849 assets identified in its research.

infrastructure protection expenditures), Port Security Grants, Rail and Transit Security Grants, Intercity Bus Security Grants, and Highway Security Grants. The Buffer Zone Protection Plan grants have been added to this set of programs. Before receiving funds, grants recipients must identify specific critical infrastructure assets, conduct threat and vulnerabilities assessments, and develop a plan for how they intend to use grant funds to reduce those vulnerabilities through eligible expenditures.⁴⁹

Issues and Discussion

Congress interest in critical infrastructure protection principally is focused on reviewing the progress and effectiveness of DHS's efforts in critical infrastructure protection.

Identifying Critical Assets, Functions, and Systems. There has been some debate about the progress and effectiveness of DHS's efforts at identifying high priority assets. For example, when developing the initial list of priority sites during Operation Liberty Shield, certain utility operators, when presented a list of what DHS considered to be critical electric power assets, noticed that some of the entries were not currently in use.⁵⁰ According to the DHS Inspector General, DHS itself determined that its early list of priority sites was unreliable.⁵¹

Over time, according to the DHS Inspector General, this initial priority list evolved into what is now called the **National Asset Database**, which, as of January 2006, contained over 77,000 entries. While DHS apparently has made progress on the reliability of the information contained in the Database, it continues to draw criticism for including thousands of assets that many believe have more local importance than national importance. There is some confusion as to what the National Asset Database is meant to be. Critics of the Database assume it is a continuation of DHS's list of high priority sites. DHS asserts that it is an inventory of assets, from which critical assets may be drawn.⁵²

In his response to the Inspector General's report, the Undersecretary for Preparedness stated that DHS does not intend to have one definitive prioritized list of critical assets. He further stated that it would not be possible or useful to develop one.⁵³ However, the Assistant Secretary for Infrastructure Protections has stated that

⁴⁹ For more information on the grant programs and the FY2007 awards, see CRS Report RL33583, *Homeland Security Grants: Evolution of Program Guidance and Grant Allocation Methods*; and CRS Report RS22383, *FY2007 Appropriations for State and Local Homeland Security*, both by Shawn Reese.

⁵⁰ Based on personal communication with industry official, September 29, 2003.

⁵¹ Department of Homeland Security. Office of the Inspector General. *Progress in Developing the National Asset Database*. Op cit. p. 16.

⁵² For more discussion of the issues associated with the National Asset Database see, CRS Report RL33648, *Critical Infrastructure: The National Asset Database*, by John Moteff.

⁵³ Department of Homeland Security. Office of the Inspector General. *Progress in* (continued...)

DHS does maintain a list of more than 600 high priority sites, which it uses to focus DHS operations, resource allocation and grants.⁵⁴ It is not clear from these officials' statements what relation this current list of 600 high priority sites has to DHS's earlier priority list or the current Database.

Also, implementation of the National Infrastructure Protection Plan (NIPP) is suppose to contribute to the identification of assets that are most critical to the nation. It remains to be seen how effective this process will be.

Assessing Vulnerabilities and Risk. Assuming DHS does maintain a list of high priority assets, it is not clear how many of these have been visited, had their vulnerability and risk assessed, or have had buffer zone protection plans developed and implemented to-date.

According to the Senate Appropriation Committee's report accompanying the FY2005 DHS appropriation,⁵⁵ 150 vulnerability assessments of high valued sites were expected to be completed in FY2004, and another 400 to be assessed in FY2005. According to the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection (IA/IP) FY2006 budget request, vulnerability assessments had been conducted at 50 high-priority sites during FY2004. No estimate was given for how many might be done during FY2005.

According to the IA/IP FY2006 budget request, 800 BZPP's had been implemented by the end of the calender year 2004. The FY2006 budget request also stated that the Directorate planned to ensure that 1000 BZPPs would be implemented in FY2005. The FY2007 budget request stated that BZPPs had been implemented at over 1800 high priority sites.

According to the IA/IP FY2006 budget request, between 150 and 180 SAVs had been conducted during FY2004. According to its FY2007 budget request, 200 were conducted in FY2005, and it expected to complete another 150 per year after that.

However, according to DHS's Performance Budget Overview for FY2007, it does not appear that nearly so many vulnerability assessments and BZPPs have been, or will be, completed and implemented by the end of FY2007. DHS's Performance Budget Overview matches specific programs with specific performance measures. Something called the Infrastructure Protection Program (perhaps what is now referred to as the Infrastructure Protection and Information Security (IPIS) budget activity (see **Appendix**)) has five performance measures listed. The first three deal with high-priority sites and associated vulnerability assessments, buffer zone protection plans, and the implementation of protective actions. According to the Performance Budget Overview, looking back to FY2005, the goals for each of these were less than 100%

⁵³ (...continued)

Developing the National Asset Database. Op cit. p. 31.

⁵⁴ *USA Today*. "Database is Just the 1st Step," by Robert Stephan. July 21, 2006. p. 8A.

⁵⁵ U.S. Congress. Senate. *Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Bill, 2005*. Report accompanying S. 2537. S.Rept. 108-280. June, 17, 2004. p. 77.

of the priority sites⁵⁶. Furthermore, the highest goal set for FY2007 was having BZPPs implemented at 38% of the priority sites.

Allocating Resources. It is a matter of policy, as articulated in the documents discussed above, that federal resources should focus on those critical infrastructure assets that, if attacked, pose the greatest risks to the nation.

Risk, in the context of critical infrastructure and terrorism, can be defined as the potential consequence associated with a particular kind of attack or event against a particular target, discounted by the likelihood that such an attack or event will occur (threat) and the likelihood that the target will sustain a certain degree of damage (vulnerability). Threat includes not only the identification of specific adversaries, but also their intentions and capabilities (both current and future). Consequences include lives and property lost, short term financial costs, longer term economic costs, environmental costs, etc. Given this definition, risk is not threat, nor vulnerability to a threat, nor the estimated consequences associated with a specific attack, but some integration of the three.⁵⁷

According to the NIPP, the allocation of resources is to be a two step process. First, those critical assets which pose the greatest risk to the nation if attacked (i.e. those assets that score highest when integrating threat, vulnerability, and consequences) are to be given the highest priority. The second step is to identify and support those protective measures that are likely to provide the greatest risk reduction for any given investment.

Federal resources are spent in a number of ways, including agencies' internal budgets for operations and programs, grants to states and localities, and research and development funding for universities and industry. The most publicized debates on the allocation of federal resources focuses primarily on grants to states and localities. The formula-based State Homeland Security Grants, mentioned above, has been criticized by some for allocating more dollars per capita to states that some perceive as having lower risks than other states. Congress has not been able to agree on if, or how, to modify the allocation of those funds. The other grant programs mentioned above (i.e. the High-threat, High-density Urban Area grants and the sector specific grants) are discretionary. According to DHS, allocation of these funds are based on a calculation not only of risk, but also on need. With the allocation of FY2006 High-Threat, High-Density Urban Area grants, some cities which perceive themselves as

⁵⁶ DHS set a goal of having BZPPs implemented at 70% of its high-priority sites. The actual amount was 18%. DHS set a goal of having vulnerability assessment done at 10% of its high-priority sites. The actual amount was 14%. It is not clear how the number of sites for which vulnerability assessments have been done can be less than the number of sites for which BZPPs have been implemented, unless DHS does not conduct vulnerability assessments for some of the BZPPs.

⁵⁷ Note, that in many cases these factors may not be independent. In other words, the likelihood that a particular asset may be attacked may increase if it is perceived to have a high vulnerability and/or the consequences of the attack are great. For more discussion of how risks can be assessed and its implications for decision making, see CRS Report RL32561, *Risk Management and Critical Infrastructure Protection: Assessing, Integrating, and Managing Threats, Vulnerabilities, and Consequences*, by John Moteff.

having greater risk (or at least being more at threat or could suffer greater losses) received less funding than they did the previous year, while other cities perceived as having lower risks saw their funds increased. DHS stated that one reason for this was the way it determined the unmet needs of the area and the programs proposed by the areas to address those needs. Faced with criticism from those cities and states that received a drop in funds, DHS has stated it will rework its grant review process. In addition, Congress has requested that the Government Accountability Office review the validity, relevance, reliability, timeliness and availability of the risk factors used by DHS in its discretionary grant programs. Meanwhile, Congress continues to set its own priorities by specifying the amount of funds that go to each these grants programs.

Information Sharing. Information sharing in the context of homeland security encompasses a very complex network of proposed connections. There is information sharing between federal agencies, especially between intelligence agencies, and between intelligence and law enforcement agencies. There is information sharing between federal agencies and their state and local counterparts. There is information sharing between federal, state, and local agencies and the private sector. There is information sharing within and between the private sectors. And there is information sharing between all of these entities and the public. A multitude of mechanisms have been established to facilitate all of this information sharing. While the multitude of mechanism may cause some concern about inefficiencies, a highly connected, in some cases redundant, network may not be a bad thing. A primary concern is if these mechanisms are being used and are effective.

In the past, information flow between all of these stakeholders has been restrained, or non-existent, for at least three reasons: a natural bureaucratic reluctance to share information, technological difficulties associated with compatibility, and legal restraints to prevent the misuse of information for unintended purposes. However, in the wake of September 11, given the apparent lack of information sharing that was exposed in reviewing events leading up to that day, many of these restraints are being reexamined and there appears to be a general consensus to change them. Some changes have resulted from the USA PATRIOT Act (including easing the restrictions on sharing of information between national law enforcement agencies and those agencies tasked with gaining intelligence of foreign agents). The legislation establishing the Department of Homeland Security also authorizes efforts to improve the ability of agencies within the federal government to share information between themselves and other entities at the state and local level. The Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act (P.L. 108-458) reorganized the entire intelligence community, in part to improve the level of communication and coordination between the various intelligence organizations.⁵⁸ The legislation also required the President to establish an **information sharing environment (ISE)** for the sharing of terrorism information among all appropriate federal, state, local, and tribal entities, and the private sector.

⁵⁸ See also CRS Report RL32366, *Terrorist Identification, Screening, Tracking Under Homeland Security Presidential Directive 6*, by William J. Krouse.

While the federal government is trying to increase the amount of information shared among appropriate stakeholders, it is also trying to maintain a tight control (short of classification) on who gets to see what information. A variety of designations have been given to information the federal government wishes to control (critical infrastructure information (see below), homeland security information, terrorism information, sensitive security information). A catch-all term for these and other designations of controlled information is “**sensitive but unclassified.**”

Since much of what is considered to be critical infrastructure is owned and operated by the private sector, critical infrastructure protection relies to a large extent on the ability of the private sector and the federal government to share information. However, it is unclear how open the private sector and the government have been in sharing information. The private sector primarily wants from government information on specific threats which the government may want to protect in order not to compromise sources or investigations. In fact, much of the threat assessment done by the federal government is considered classified. For its part, the government wants specific information on vulnerabilities and incidents which companies may want to protect to prevent adverse publicity or to keep confidential company practices. Success will depend on the ability of each side to demonstrate it can hold in confidence the information exchanged. From the private sector’s point-of-view, too, is concern about whether providing this information might lead to future regulatory action or other liabilities.

Sharing information between government and the private sector is made more complex by the question of how the information will be handled within the context of the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA). In particular, the private sector is reluctant to share the kind of information the government wants without it being exempt from public disclosure under the existing FOIA statute. The Homeland Security Act (P.L. 107-296, Sec. 214) exempts information defined as **critical infrastructure information** from FOIA (as well as providing other protections). Similar FOIA exemptions are offered in other legislation. For example, the Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Act (P.L.107-188, Sec. 401, see below) exempts certain security-related information from FOIA. Even with these protections in statute, it is uncertain how much information on assets, vulnerabilities, incidents, etc. is flowing into DHS.⁵⁹

The FOIA exemptions for critical infrastructure information (CII) and other types of sensitive but unclassified information is not without its critics. The non-government-organizations that actively oppose government secrecy are reluctant to expand the government’s ability to hold more information as classified or sensitive. These critics, and others, feel that the protections offered to CII and other types of sensitive but unclassified information is too broad and believe that controls are

⁵⁹ In February 2005, OMB Watch won a FOIA case asking DHS for the number of submissions, rejections, program procedures, etc. associated with the critical infrastructure information (CII) program. DHS acknowledged the receipt of 29 submissions of CII documents, 22 of which were approved as CII by DHS. See, *DHS Finally Speaks on CII* at [<http://www.ombwatch.org/article/articleprint/2683/-1/321>]. Site last viewed on Dec. 26, 2006.

stifling public debate and oversight, as well as impeding technological advances that could benefit both security and the economy.⁶⁰

Regulation. As a general statement of policy, owners and operators of critical infrastructure are to work with the federal government on a voluntary basis. Sharing information with the federal government about vulnerability assessments, risk assessments, and the taking of additional protective actions is meant to be voluntary.

However, the degree to which some of the activities are mandated varies across sectors. In some cases, sectors are quite regulated. Nuclear power plants must meet very specific standards for assessing their vulnerabilities to very specific types of attacks and to take the necessary actions to address those vulnerabilities. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission enforces these regulations. The Maritime Transportation Security Act (P.L.107-295) requires facilities at ports, and certain vessels, to conduct vulnerability assessments and to develop and implement security plans (including naming a security officer who is responsible for developing and implementing these plans). The vulnerability assessments and security plans are reviewed by the Coast Guard. The Public Health Security and Bioterrorism Preparedness Act (P.L. 107-188) requires community drinking water systems to conduct vulnerability assessments and to incorporate the results of those assessments into their emergency response plans. The vulnerability assessments must be submitted to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The EPA must also receive certification that the emergency response plans have been appropriately modified to reflect the vulnerability assessments. This same Act also amended the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require all facilities engaged in manufacturing, processing, packing, or holding food for consumption to register with the Department of Health and Human Services. In addition, the Food and Drug Act was amended to require regulations specifying the types of information these facilities needed to keep on record for a specified amount of time to assist the Secretary in determining if a food product has been adulterated and represents a public health problem. The FY2006 DHS appropriation bill (P.L. 109-295, Sec. 550), authorized the Secretary of Homeland Security, for three years, to issue interim final regulations requiring vulnerability assessments and security plans for certain chemical facilities, except those covered by the Maritime Transportation and Security Act or other relevant acts affecting drinking water authorities, or those operated by the Department of Energy or the Department of Defense, or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

At the other end of the spectrum are sectors such as information and telecommunication, oil and gas, commercial (i.e. malls and office buildings) where similar activities (i.e., vulnerability assessments, etc.) are encouraged but not mandated.

⁶⁰ For a discussion of the issues associated with sensitive but unclassified information as it relates not only to scientific and technological information, but other policy relevant information held by or given to the federal government, see CRS Report RL33303, *“Sensitive But Unclassified Information” and Other Controls: Policy and Options for Scientific and Technical Information*, by Genevieve J. Knezo.

Appendix

Federal Funding for Critical Infrastructure Protection

It is not possible to definitively determine how much funding the federal government devotes to critical infrastructure protection. The Homeland Security Act requires the President's Budget to include a budget analysis of homeland security activities across the federal government. For purposes of its analysis, OMB categorizes funding according to the mission areas defined in the *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. These include intelligence and warning; border and transportation security; domestic counter-terrorism, critical infrastructure and key asset protection; defending against catastrophic events; and emergency preparedness and response. While there is a separate category for critical infrastructure protection, activities included in some of the other mission areas can also be relevant or necessary for critical infrastructure protection. Table A.1. below shows the funding figures for the critical infrastructure protection mission area taken from the FY2007 budget's analysis.

Table A.1. Critical Infrastructure Protection Funding by Department
(\$ in millions)

Department	FY2005 enacted	FY2005 suppl.	FY2006 enacted	FY2006 suppl.	FY2007 request
Agriculture	150.7		93.2		46.0
Defense	10838.2	847.8	11096.8		11304.3
Energy	1456.1		1523.7		1503.6
HHS	168.2		181.7		188.8
Homeland Security	2580.9		2678.5		2898.0
Justice	468.8	1.3	521.1		568.3
Transportation	137.0		132.5		154.0
Veterans Affairs	212.8		273.5		271.2
NASA	220.5		212.6		203.7
NSF	315.2		317.2		359.4
Social Security	150.6		172.0		178.5
Postal Service	503.0	
Other Agencies	633.9	0.4	649.2		675.0
Grand Total	17835.9	849.4	17851.7		18350.6

Source: OMB, Budget of the U.S. Government, FY2007 Analytical Perspectives. Chapter 3. Homeland Security Funding Analysis. p. 26.

Much of this funding is spent by agencies to protect their own critical infrastructure. It also includes funds that agencies may spend working with states, local governments, and private owners/operators to reduce their respective

vulnerabilities. DHS activities include both of these as well as activities associated with coordinating the national effort.

Other mission areas include activities that might also be considered part of the effort to protect critical infrastructure. For instance, the intelligence and warning mission area includes threat analysis, risk analysis, and the sharing of that information with other stakeholders, including states, localities, and the private sector, each of which factor into critical infrastructure protection. Border and transportation security includes activities associated with protecting airports, sea ports, and other transportation modes.

In many cases, funding for homeland security (and critical infrastructure protection) is buried within a number of different accounts, activities, programs, and projects. It is not possible to track Congressional appropriations in each of these mission areas within the agencies' appropriations bills. Agencies may not know themselves until their appropriations are allocated.

The Preparedness Directorate's FY2007 Budget Request and Appropriations for Infrastructure Protection and Information Security and Other Relevant DHS Budget Activities

Just as it is difficult to account for all the federal activities associated with critical infrastructure protection in the federal government, it is also difficult to track the critical infrastructure protection activities within the Department of Homeland Security. Below (**Table A.2**) is the FY2007 budget request and appropriations for the Infrastructure Protection and Information Security portion of the Preparedness Directorate's budget.⁶¹ Infrastructure Protection and Information Security (IPIS) is one of seven budget activities within the Preparedness Directorate's budget. In turn, the IPIS budget supports eight program or project activities, as listed in the table. Each of these support a number of subprograms. The Management and Administration activity supports the salaries and administrative expenses of IPIS. While the subprograms are not discussed further in this Appendix, some of their activities may have been referred to in the text of this report (e.g. activities associated with Critical Infrastructure Information, the National Infrastructure Protection Plan, or the National Asset Database).

⁶¹ The IPIS budget activity supports the same (though slightly restructured) infrastructure protection programs and projects of the "old" Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate. The Post-Katrina Emergency Management Reform Act of 2006, (Title VI of the FY2007 DHS appropriations bill), which transferred FEMA and the state and local grant programs out of the Preparedness Directorate, left the IPIS program in the Preparedness Directorate.

Table A.2 Funding for the Information Analysis and Infrastructure Protection Directorate

(\$ in millions)

Infrastructure Protection and Information Security Budget Activity				
Program/Project Activity	FY2005 actual	FY2006 enacted	FY2007 request	FY2007 Apprn.
Management and administration	^a	82,509	84,650	77,000
Critical infrastructure outreach and partnerships	98,254	111,055	101,100	101,100
Critical infrastructure identification and evaluation	43,684	67,815	71,631	69,000
National infrastructure simulation and analysis center	20,000	19,800	16,021	25,000
Biosurveillance	1,569	13,959	8,218	8,218
Protective actions	149,868	90,485	32,043	32,043
Cyber security	54,205	92,415	92,205	92,000
National security/emergency preparedness telecommunications	137,523	141,206	143,272	143,272
Total IPIS (w/o Management and Administration)	(505,703)	(536,735)	(464,490)	(470,633)
Total IPIS		619,244	549,140	547,633

Source: FY2007 Congressional Justification. Preparedness Directorate. Infrastructure Protection and Information Security and the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act of 2007, (H.Rept. 109-699, accompanying H.R. 5441, P.L. 109-295).

- a. The Management and Administration account of the “old” IA/IP Directorate for FY2005 is not comparable to the Management and Administration account of the “new” Preparedness Directorate.

Another part of the FY2007 Preparedness Directorate’s budget which includes some critical infrastructure protection activities is the State and Local Programs budget activity. Included in this budget activity are the formula-based State Homeland Security Grant Program and the discretionary High-threat, High-density Urban Areas grants, the grant programs directed at specific transportation modes (e.g. ports, rail, trucking, mass transit, and intercity bus.), and the grants for Buffer Zone Protection Program (BZPP). The State Homeland Security Grants and the High-threat, High-density Urban Areas Grants primarily support first responder capabilities, but funding can also be spent on critical infrastructure protection expenses (such as the purchase of cameras, sensors, etc.).

In FY2006, Congress appropriated \$544 million for the formula-based State Homeland Security grants and \$1.1 billion for the various discretionary grant programs. For FY2007, the Administration requested \$633 million for the formula-based State Homeland Security grants and \$1.4 billion for the discretionary grants (\$838 million for the High-threat High-density Urban Area grants and \$600 million for the mode-specific programs and BZPP). Congress appropriated \$525 million for the State Homeland Security grants, \$770 million for the High-threat High-density Urban Area grants, and a total of \$459 for the mode-specific and BZPP grants.

The Administration once again requested that the individual discretionary grants for specific transportation modes, ports and the BZPP, be aggregated into a single Targeted Infrastructure Protection grant program, with the allocation based on the Department's calculation of risk and need. Congress again rejected that request in the FY2007 appropriation bill, choosing instead to specify the allocations between modes (\$210 million for ports, \$12 million for trucking, \$12 million for intercity bus, \$175 million for rail and mass transit, and \$50 million for BZPP).

The Transportation Security Administration (TSA) within the Border and Transportation Security Directorate is responsible for overseeing the security of the nation's transportation sectors (as directed by the Aviation and Transportation Security Act, P.L. 107-71). Aviation security consumes a large fraction of the TSA budget. The Administration requested \$4.7 billion in FY2007 for all facets of aviation security activities such as passenger and baggage screening; the purchase, installation, and operation of explosive detection equipment; and airport perimeter security. Of this amount, the Administration expects to offset \$3.7 billion with fees. TSA also requested \$37.2 million for its surface transportation security activities, primarily for staffing and for rail inspectors and canines. Congress appropriated slightly more than \$4.7 billion for all aviation security programs and anticipated only \$2.4 billion in offsetting fees. Congress appropriated the requested level for surface transportation security efforts.

The Coast Guard is the lead agency for security of the nation's ports. While the Coast Guard budget does not include a specific security-related line items, OMB estimated, in its homeland security analysis, that the FY2007 budget included more than \$2 billion for port security, primarily for Coast Guard activities. In the FY2007 appropriation bill, Congress specified \$15 million for port security inspections.

Finally, the Science and Technology Directorate budget supports research and development in a number of areas relevant to critical infrastructure protection. Two of its research portfolios are Critical Infrastructure and Cybersecurity. In FY2007, the Administration requested \$15 million for Critical Infrastructure and \$23 million for Cybersecurity. Congress appropriated \$35 million and \$20 million, respectively.