



Department of Energy
Washington, DC 20585

October 30, 2015

MEMORANDUM FOR INGRID KOLB
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT

JM Chronology
JM RECEIVED 11/3/15
OUT FOR REVIEW 11/6/15
DRB DISCUSSION 11/19/15

THROUGH: *Camille Belen*
for KEVIN T. HAGERTY
DIRECTOR
OFFICE OF INFORMATION RESOURCES

FROM: MATTHEW B. MOURY *MB Moury*
ASSOCIATE UNDER SECRETARY FOR
ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH, SAFETY AND SECURITY

SUBJECT: Notice of Intent to Revise DOE Order 470.3B, *Graded Security Protection (GSP) Policy*

PURPOSE: Request approval to revise the subject Order to make significant changes which are required for the Order to be consistent with threat information received from the Intelligence community. Information provided by the joint DOE/IN and Defense Intelligence Agency, *Nuclear Security Threat Capabilities Assessment*, revealed the need to adjust adversary numbers and capabilities to reflect the intent of the policy and the inherent risk management considerations. The requested revision also incorporates previously identified changes intended to correct editorial errors; updated or canceled references; changes in organizational names/responsibilities; and clarify the intent of various sections. This change will also update or remove outdated information; make minor textual changes for clarity; ensure consistency with existing laws, regulations, and DOE directives; and reflect a new title *Design Basis Threat (DBT) Policy*.

JUSTIFICATION: The DBT (formerly GSP) Policy is a performance metric, not a threat statement or an intelligence assessment. It is designed to represent a stable set of goals for the planning and implementation interval for Departmental safeguards and security programs for the next 3 – 5 years. While it embodies risk management by limiting the threat that must be addressed, further adjustments to Department-wide performance standards may be justified by specific site and/or mission imperatives. DOE's security risk management philosophy is based on establishing and maintaining a graded approach and defense-in-depth safeguards and security program. Several factors were identified during the 2015 annual review which highlighted the need to update the policy in terms of the risk management considerations, which include the consequence posed by the loss, theft, and/or unauthorized use of an asset; intelligence pertaining to current and future objectives and characteristics of adversaries. The policy is beyond the predicated intelligence life-cycle and requires a revision.



Rec'd Remark 11/3/15

IMPACT: The proposed directive does not duplicate existing laws, regulations or national standards and it does not create undue burden on the Department.

WRITER: Gary White, Office of Security Assistance, (301) 903-6874

OPI/OPI CONTACT: Samuel N Callahan, Office of Security, (301) 903-3767

Ingrid Kolb, Director, Office of Management (MA-1):

Concur:  Nonconcur: _____ Date: 11-23-2015

Unless determined otherwise by the Directives Review Board (DRB), writers will have up to 60 days in which to develop their first draft and submit to the Office of Information Resources, MA-90.

| <u>Standard Schedule for Directives Development</u> | <u>Days</u> |
|---|---------------|
| Draft Development | Up to 60 days |
| Review and Comment (RevCom) | 30 |
| Comment Resolution | 30 |
| Final Review | 30 |
| Total | 150 |

(NOTE: The standard schedule of up to 150 days will be used unless otherwise specified by the Directives Review Board.)