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Thursday, March 1, 2018

U.S. Senate
Committee on Armed Services
Washington, D.C.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m. in Room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. James Inhofe presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES INHOFE, U.S. SENATOR FROM OKLAHOMA

Senator Inhofe: The meeting will come to order.

The committee meets today to consider the nomination of Lieutenant General Paul Nakasone to be Commander of the U.S. Cyber Command and Director of the National Security Agency and Chief of the Central Security Service. That’s quite a bit of stuff there.

Also, Dr. Brent Park to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation at the National Nuclear Security Administration; and Ms. Anne Marie White to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management.

We thank you for joining us this morning.

Also, at the appropriate time, we would invite you to introduce your families, which I have already had the honor of meeting.

It’s standard procedure and it is a requirement of this committee to ask certain questions, so I’d like to ask seven questions, and if you would just vocally come out with a yes or no at the same time.

Have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

General Nakasone: I have.

Dr. Park: Yes.

Ms. White: Yes.
Senator Inhofe: And will you ensure that your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in the hearings?

General Nakasone: Yes.
Dr. Park: Yes.
Ms. White: Yes.

Senator Inhofe: Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to congressional requests?

General Nakasone: Yes.
Dr. Park: Yes.
Ms. White: Yes.

Senator Inhofe: Will those witnesses be protected from reprisal for their testimony in briefings?

General Nakasone: Yes.
Dr. Park: Yes.
Ms. White: Yes.

Senator Inhofe: Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this committee?

General Nakasone: Yes.
Dr. Park: Yes.
Ms. White: Yes.

Senator Inhofe: Do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a
timely manner when requested by a duly constituted
committee, or to consult with the committee regarding the
basis for any good-faith delay or denial in providing such
documents?

General Nakasone: Yes.
Dr. Park: Yes.
Ms. White: Yes.

Senator Inhofe: Okay. And lastly, have you assumed
any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to
presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

General Nakasone: No.
Dr. Park: No.
Ms. White: No.

Senator Inhofe: All right.

General Nakasone, if confirmed, you will become the
first Commander of the U.S. Cyber Command as a unified
combatant command. Creating the unified command is an
important step, but much work remains for you to do,
especially with regard to centralizing the responsibilities
currently spread across three different agencies. We have
DOD, we have FBI, and you have DHS.

Another one of your top priorities, if confirmed, must
be ensuring that Cyber Command readiness. If the services
do not deliver their required tools, capabilities and
personnel, we are in danger of a hollow cyber force.
Two days ago Admiral Rogers was repeatedly questioned by this committee on the role of the Cyber Command and specifically his command’s response to the Russian disinformation campaign around our 2016 presidential elections. Unfortunately, the partisan propensity to discredit our president consumed over half of that hearing. Hopefully that’s not going to happen again today. It would be a disservice in two ways.

First, it assumes that Cyber Command action would be the only response to the Russian disinformation campaign when, in reality, it should be a whole-of-government approach, especially given that disinformation is just part of the threat that Russia poses to the United States. If confirmed, it will be your responsibility to provide insight and recommendations to policymakers on the whole-of-government approach to respond to these attempts.

Secondly and perhaps more problematic for the committee’s role today, the full scope of the U.S. Cyber Command, the stated mission of the Cyber Command is to defend the homeland, defend military computer networks, and develop and employ military cyber capabilities. That is a robust task, and the committee should ensure that General Nakasone is fully vetted on all aspects of that command.

The National Defense Strategy makes it clear that if renewed Great Power competition with Russia and China leaves
every domain, including cyber, contested without coercion across the entire government, that we will remain at a significant disadvantage.

By the way, we had three of the senators with me over the past 13 or 14 days actually looking into this. We are in the area of the South China Sea, where we had a growing threat from China and some things that we were not even aware of prior to going there.

Dr. Park, you’ve been nominated to oversee the NNSA’s mission to detect, secure, and dispose of dangerous nuclear and radiological material. If confirmed, the committee expects you to address the proliferation of nuclear and radiological materials among both state and non-state actors, develop technologies to detect nuclear and radiological proliferation worldwide, and to collaborate internationally to secure the safe expansion of global nuclear energy.

And, Ms. White, if confirmed, you will be responsible for the safe and timely cleanup of our nuclear waste. Unfortunately, the environmental office of DOE has been plagued with management issues, safety concerns, and continuous technical challenges. You’ve got your work cut out for you there.

Senator Reed?
STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND

Senator Reed: Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to welcome our witnesses and congratulate them for their service already and for their willingness to serve in the Department of Defense and other agencies.

Let me also recognize your families, who are such an important part of your contribution to the nation. Thank you all.

General Nakasone, your service as the Commander of Cyber Command’s National Mission Force, Commander of the Army Cyber Command, and the Commander of Joint Task Force ARES, which targets ISIS Internet propaganda and recruiting, in addition to your extensive experience in intelligence, makes you a highly qualified individual to serve as Director of the NSA and Commander of CYBERCOM.

If confirmed, the challenges that you will face include disrupting and exposing cyber-enabled information operations conducted by Russia and other countries. As Admiral Rogers pointed out, the Russians are conducting these operations as we speak, and we have to do something. Working with other stakeholders, you have to develop whole-of-DOD and whole-of-government approaches to cyber and information warfare; and establishing deterrence policy and capabilities that will, in time, help to prevent significant nation-state cyber and
information warfare attacks against the United States. These are no small tasks, but it is more important now than ever that these threats to our national security are confronted head-on and not ignored.

Dr. Park, you are nominated to be the Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, the primary role in the National Nuclear Security Agency for controlling the spread of nuclear material around the world and promoting its peaceful use. In that regard, this committee will look to you as the point person for ensuring countries that want to develop peaceful uses of nuclear energy are technically capable of doing so, while assisting the International Atomic Energy Agency with the ability to conduct monitoring. Nuclear nonproliferation remains vital to maintaining our national security and global stability. If confirmed, we will be asking you to give us your forthright assessment on nuclear proliferation concerns in the Middle East, North Korea, and around the world.

Ms. White, you are nominated to serve as the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management. If confirmed, it will be your responsibility to oversee the large and complex cleanup operations involving former defense production sites at the Department of Energy. Since the cleanup program began more than 25 years ago, the majority of the less complex sites have been completed.
Current cleanup operations require much more care due to their complexity. These include sites like Hanford, Washington, which has some 55 million gallons in 177 underground tanks; and Los Alamos, New Mexico, which is resuming plutonium disposal operations at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant after an accident four years ago.

You will be challenged to complete these projects quickly and efficiently, under the tight budget constraints required by your obligation to serve as a steward of taxpayer dollars. If confirmed, we will look to you to give us regular updates on your progress on these issues, while ensuring you have clear lines of communication to the states where these operations take place.

I would again like to thank the nominees for your willingness to serve, and I thank you very much for your service to our nation. Thank you.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Reed.

What we’re going to do now is have opening statements. We’re going to try to confine them, as close as you can, to 5 minutes. Your entire statement will be made a part of the record, and we won’t count the time against you as you introduce your family.

We’re going to start with General Nakasone.
General Nakasone: Senator Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, and distinguished members of the committee, I am honored to appear before you today regarding my nomination as Commander, U.S. Cyber Command and Director of the National Security Agency, Chief Central Security Service.

I want to thank President Trump, Secretary Mattis, and General Dunford for their confidence in nominating me for these important positions.

Let me also thank my wife Susan for being here. I owe much of my success to her love and support --

Senator Inhofe: Raise your hand, Susan, so we know who you are. There we are.

General Nakasone: -- throughout nearly 25 years of marriage, 19 moves, and numerous deployments.

Susan and I are also joined today by our children Sarah, David, and Joseph. Our son Daniel, our eldest son, is in college today taking his midterms. We are exceptionally proud of all of them.

I want to thank Admiral Mike Rogers for his 36 years of commissioned service to our nation. Admiral Rogers has led Cyber Command and the NSA during a time of incredible
transformation and rapid growth. I thank him and his wife Dana for all they have done in service to our nation.

For the past 10 years, I have had the privilege to lead, plan, and execute Joint and Army cyberspace operations supporting national, Combatant Command, and service missions. In this decade I have seen incredible growth in the cyber capacity and capabilities within the Department of Defense. From the stand-up of our cyber mission force to the daily operations conducted by Joint Task Force ARES, we are rapidly maturing our cyber forces.

When I first started working cyber operations, these operations were often just concepts, and when conducted, performed ad-hoc by technical specialists on loan from other organizations. Today this is not the case. Now, a mature and highly capable cyber force is built and in the fight, aggressively defending our network, conducting daily operations against adversaries, and strengthening the combat power and lethality of U.S. forces around the world.

This swift growth represents tremendous opportunity, and if confirmed, I plan to continue this impressive progress.

But I’ve also seen cyber threats to our nation grow exponentially, and adapt just as quickly. From adversaries conducting exploitation of our networks, to the harnessing of social media platforms for false messaging, to targeting
our elections, to destructive attacks, the Department and
our nation face significant challenges in this ever-growing
domain.

These challenges have taught me several important
lessons over this past decade.

First, that operating and aggressively defending our
networks is a foundational mission. Our network is our
weapons platform.

Second, I’ve learned that we need to impose costs on
our adversaries to ensure mission success by persistent
delivery of cyberspace effects in defense of our nation and
in support of our combat forces.

Third, I’ve learned that defending the nation in
cyberspace is a team effort, requiring a whole-of-nation
approach -- government, military, industry, and academia --
as well as international coalition partnerships.

The fourth and most important of these cornerstones, I
have learned that while technology drives change in
cyberspace, it’s the people -- the soldiers, the sailors,
the airmen, the Marines, the Coast Guardsmen, along with our
civilians -- who guarantee our success. Our people demand
and deserve the best leadership, training, and equipment to
do their mission.

I recognize that Cyber Command and the National
Security Agency are two unique and vital organizations with
their own identities, authorities, and oversight mechanisms.
1 I am committed to leading both with vision, with drive, and
2 with purpose for the future. Cyberspace is dynamic, and
3 adaptive approaches are always needed to solve the new
4 challenges constantly emerging.
5
6 Finally, I sit before you today with the understanding
7 that we are at a defining time for our nation and our
8 military. Near-peer competitors are posturing themselves,
9 and threats to the United States’ global advantage are
10 growing. Nowhere is this challenge more evident than in
11 cyberspace.
12
13 With this in mind, if confirmed to lead U.S. Cyber
14 Command and the National Security Agency, I will ensure our
15 military commanders and national decision-makers can call
16 upon an aggressive and globally dominant cyber force with
17 the capability and capacity to defend us at home and apply
18 pressure on our adversaries abroad.
19
20 In closing, I am deeply honored to be considered for
21 these leadership positions. If confirmed, I look forward to
22 working with the committee and the entire Congress to ensure
23 we leverage our opportunities and also address our
24 challenges.
25
26 Senator Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, thank you for the
27 opportunity to be here this morning. I look forward to
28 answering your questions.
[The prepared statement of General Nakasone follows:]
Senator Inhofe: Thank you, General. Dr. Park?
STATEMENT OF DR. BRENT K. PARK, TO BE DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR FOR DEFENSE NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION, NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Dr. Park: Chairman Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, distinguished members of the committee, it is a tremendous privilege to appear before you today. I am honored to have this opportunity to serve my country and wish to thank President Trump and Secretary Perry for having placed their confidence in my ability to lead the NNSA’s Office of DNN.

Mr. Chairman and the members of the committee, if you will permit me, I will introduce my family, my wife, Min Park, of 23 years, and my two daughters, Clara and Ella, who are with us; and watching from afar are my parents in Nevada. And finally, I would like to thank my close friends and colleagues for their support and good counsel during the confirmation process.

Mr. Chairman, the United States has long been a leader in the global effort to combat nuclear proliferation. NNSA’s Office of DNN leads those efforts, securing nuclear material around the world, building international partnerships to raise barriers against the illicit transfer of proliferation-sensitive technologies or materials, and eliminating highly enriched uranium and separated plutonium.

If confirmed, my top priority will be to continue executing DNN’s crucial mission, supporting the President’s
objectives of achieving and maintaining a balance between
the promotion of legitimate nuclear commerce and controlling
the spread of weapons-usable material, equipment,
technology, and expertise.

Mirroring NNSA Administrator Lisa Gordon-Hagerty’s
recent testimony, these objectives cannot be accomplished
without people. If confirmed, maintaining the core
competency of the workforce across the enterprise will also
be one of my highest priorities.

A significant portion of the NNSA workforce,
specifically scientists, engineers and technicians, are
approaching retirement in the next five years. To retain
critical nuclear nonproliferation and weapons expertise, and
cross-train the workforce, I will work to ensure that we are
able to employ the brightest and the best by recruiting,
retaining, and growing the highly skilled workforce needed
to strengthen the nation’s security against nuclear threats.

For more than 20 years, and most recently as the
Associate Director at Oak Ridge National Lab, my
professional life has been dedicated to the nuclear security
enterprise. I have led and managed the complex
interdisciplinary science and engineering programs and
formulated transformational R&D, built on sound business and
operational experience. My work has included collaboration
with the U.S. national defense, homeland security, and
intelligence communities in the application of advanced
technologies to meet national security requirements.

As the Director of the DOE/NNSA Remote Sensing
Laboratory, I led the efforts to advance and field cutting-
edge technologies in support of counterterrorism and
radiological incident response for the nation. To lead
NNSA’s DNN office, if confirmed, would be the highest honor
of my career.

Mr. Chairman, defense nuclear nonproliferation, and
indeed the nuclear security enterprise, is at a crossroads.
Should I be confirmed, I will work tirelessly with my NNSA,
DOE, and interagency counterparts to ensure the United
States continues to lead in the global efforts to combat
nuclear proliferation and terrorism.

Again, I thank you for inviting me to appear before
this committee today. I am prepared to answer any questions
you have now and, if confirmed, to address questions that
you may have in the future.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Park follows:]
Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Dr. Park.

Ms. White?
STATEMENT OF ANNE MARIE WHITE, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY FOR ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Ms. White: Senator Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, and members of the committee and professional committee staff, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you as the President’s nominee to be Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management at the Department of Energy. My warmest thanks to your respective staff for taking the time to share the issues of concern regarding environmental management and for outlining expectations of me in the role of EM-1, a role that involves fulfilling our moral obligation to provide a cleaner, safer, healthier environment by having a clear plan of action to address our nation’s environmental legacy challenges from World War II and the Cold War.

I am honored to appear before the committee and thank President Trump and Secretary Perry for displaying their confidence in me through nomination to this important position. Should the United States Senate honor me with its confirmation, I look forward to working together with you and your staff to resolve the demanding issues that confront the nation by safely reducing environmental and cost risk and delivering meaningful results that protect the U.S. taxpayer.

I would like to introduce Scott Anderson to the
committee. Scott is my best friend, strongest advocate, and greatest supporter. I also thank my close friends and colleagues for being here today.

My Master’s degree is in nuclear engineering, and I was fortunate enough to have graduated at a time when the environmental field was relatively new and rife with opportunities for innovation and development. With my degree, a creative and curious mindset, and an appreciation for our environment, I determined the nuclear cleanup field was a good fit for me.

I began my career performing physical cleanup work in the field. My strategy was to learn the environmental business bottom up rather than top down. This has been instrumental in developing my understanding, from multiple vantage points, of the complex challenges facing the Department in its environmental management mission.

It is important to note, this work is not without some level of risk. The women and men in the field implementing plans and delivering projects are of primary importance at the EM sites. Without these individuals in the field, dressing out in protective gear and doing difficult physical work, there would be no cleanup and no risk reduction. Maintaining and further building trust with the workforce that we rely on to address our nation’s environmental legacy challenges will be a focus throughout my tenure.
My early career experience in the field was informative and provided a sound basis to help me form my consulting firm. Since founding my firm, my years working within the commercial and government nuclear industry and the mentoring from well-respected industry experts have helped me grow into an experienced leader and innovative problem solver.

For the past 25 years, I have consulted with commercial, government, and international organizations solving complex problems here at home and abroad. I have worked at a number of EM sites, providing me with direct experience addressing the difficult technical and stakeholder issues the Department faces while driving forward the cleanup mission.

Through the years I have had the good fortune to work and collaborate with a wonderful group of smart, technically savvy peers to cost-effectively solve seemingly intractable problems. This was done through teamwork, innovation, ingenuity, and optimization. Over the course of my career, I have been able to work on, visit, and understand some of the world’s great nuclear and environmental challenges. Therefore, I consider this potential key leadership position at DOE-EM to be an opportunity to maximize my private sector experience and knowledge to assist the Department in mitigating risk and working toward eliminating existing environmental liabilities.
Should I be confirmed, accountability to safely meet responsibilities, commitments, and milestones will start with me, and I will further expect Federal staff and our contractors to deliver results that will protect the investments made by the hardworking American taxpayers. I further commit to you that I will communicate and work closely with this committee, the conscientious staff within the Department, Congress, Native American tribes, regulators, local communities, and the dedicated site workforce to set priorities that will have current and lasting positive impact on the overall EM program.

Senator Inhofe, Ranking Member Reed, and members of the committee, thank you again for this opportunity to appear before you as the President’s nominee for Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management. I look forward to answering your questions as you consider my nomination.

[The prepared statement of Ms. White follows:]
Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Ms. White.

Be informed that we have votes coming up at 11:45, and so probably by noon we’re going to try to finish this hearing.

And then also there will be some people leaving, both Democrats and Republicans, for a short time because we are also meeting with another committee at the same time, including myself. So this will be a little bit of an in and out.

We’ll have 5-minute rounds. Is that okay with you?

Senator Reed: Sure.

Senator Inhofe: Okay.

General Nakasone, the mission of Cyber Command, as I said in my opening statement, is to defend the homeland, defending military computer networks, and developing and employing military cyber capability.

As the combatant commander, you are an operational command that has got to operate within the authorities that you are given. You are not responsible for developing cyber policy but are responsible for executing the established policy.

Russia used online media, as was called to our attention, to try to influence and degrade our election process in 2016, which has nothing to do with you, but I have a question to ask you, General Nakasone. Two days ago
Admiral Rogers was asked multiple times about who is responsible and what our response should be to another attack by Russia on our elections. There are a lot of options that we could do in response -- sanctions, counter-attack, and more. If this happened again, can you walk us through how the government could respond to this and what your role would be in that decision-making process, what your role would be?

Use your mic.

General Nakasone: Senator, thank you. In terms of my responsibility, my role, if confirmed as Commander of U.S. Cyber Command, that is to provide a series of options to our civilian leadership for their determination whether or not actions would be taken against an adversary. In this case, the case that you laid out, the ultimate response, obviously, resides with the President for that decision, and Congress. But in terms of response and the responsibility for our critical infrastructure at this time, that process rests with Department of Homeland Security.

What I would say in terms of the options that I would provide, obviously they are focused on cyber options, but there are probably a wide variety of different options that should be considered. Deterrence in this space could come from a number of capabilities that our nation provides.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you.
Admiral Rogers, two days ago when he was testifying, he said -- and this is a quote -- he said, “We are not where we need to be with respect to the structure and organization of the whole-of-government approach to cyber attacks on the homeland.”

Now, we talked about this before, and you’ve been addressing this with the FBI, DHS, and DOD. Do you have any ideas for improvements that we could make structurally in this process?

General Nakasone: Senator, when I look at the structure that’s laid out today and the role of DOD, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and Department of Homeland Security, each with their unique authorities and their unique capabilities, I’m struck that what we must do with this structure is improve the crosstalk, the coordination, the sharing that goes on. If you consider today that 90 percent of our networks are within the private sector, that private sector is likely to be the first indicator of some type of intrusion or attack, the importance of being able to share that information rapidly amongst all three players to ensure that we understand what is going on and being able to address it is paramount.

So I come back to this very, very close coordination that must be improved as we look at the three different elements.
Senator Inhofe:  Okay.  I wouldn’t expect you to come up with results because this has been a problem that’s been there since we established the program.

Dr. Park, I want to just get a comment from you having to do with the Iran deal that was made under the Obama Administration. Several of the most important provisions to deter the regime from becoming a nuclear state contained sunset clauses set to expire in just a few years.

Dr. Park, how can the U.S. mitigate proliferation potential in Iran after these provisions expire in a few years? Do you have any ideas on that?

Dr. Park: So, Senator, it requires an international partnership working closely with the IAEA to make sure whatever they do in terms of operating nuclear reactors and so on are strictly monitored. We have been developing, in fact advancing proliferation detection systems out of DNN office, and we will work closely with all the stakeholders to make sure they comply with all the rules and regulations imposed on them.

Senator Inhofe: Okay. That’s very good.

Ms. White, I do have a question for you, but what we’re going to try to do is stay on schedule. So it will come from one of the other members here shortly.

Senator Reed?

Senator Reed: I’ll try to ask the question of Ms.
White. In fact, let me start with Ms. White.

Ms. White, the Hanford site, can you tell us very quickly what do you expect where the progress can be made there the most quickly? Because it is one of the most significant and expensive sites.

Ms. White: The Hanford site is very complex. There are numerous challenges there, from tank waste to some of the waste management issues. One thing I like to consider when I’m looking at these problems is that there’s a very long time scale involved in all things nuclear, so we need to make sure we make decisions that are timely, that are technically underpinned and cost underpinned. That’s the kind of decision-making I would be applying to not only Hanford but all of our great environmental challenges we face across the complex.

Senator Reed: Thank you very much.

General Nakasone, the National Defense Science Board Task Force, the Defense Science Board Task Force made recommendations to develop campaign plans essentially to go after deterrence, or be prepared to go after key assets of our opponents, such as the wealth of Putin oligarchs, their financial transactions, corruption in Iran, information issues with respect to Russia, China, and North Korea.

Do you agree with those recommendations?

General Nakasone: Senator, I do agree with the
recommendations. I thought the Defense Science Board, as they laid out both what we should hold at risk and also the idea of resilience and the continuing challenges of attribution, were three critical points that I think come together and speak to the larger issue.

Senator Reed: Are you -- are we preparing such plans, detailed campaign plans with respect to these potential issues?

General Nakasone: So, Senator, given the open nature of this conference, let me simply state yes.

Senator Reed: Okay. But, as I think the Chairman indicated, any of these plans, to be executed, require the civilian approval by the SecDefs, and then ultimately the President.

General Nakasone: That is correct, Senator.

Senator Reed: In terms of the critical infrastructure, so much of it is privately held, and there are variable degrees of attention paid by the private sector to these cyber issues, which I think leads us to significant vulnerabilities. Is that your assessment also?

General Nakasone: Senator, I would say that there are varying degrees of resilience within our critical infrastructure today, yes.

Senator Reed: And I know you’re not the lead agency. That, I presume, would be the Department of Homeland
Security. But you will be participating in the all-of-
government approach to this. Are you satisfied with the
level of effort, the speed? Are we getting our act together
quickly enough to face these potential threats?

General Nakasone: So, Senator, in my current
responsibilities as Commander of Army Cyber, I don’t have as
robust a picture as I need to, and certainly, if confirmed,
that’s one of the things I would look at. I would offer as
a general statement I’m never satisfied with defense of
anything, so I think we have to take a hard look every
single day.

Senator Reed: Thank you, sir.

Dr. Park, at present, the government of Saudi Arabia is
tendering offers to build nuclear reactors for electricity
production. After the first Iraq war, we learned and
discovered that the Iraqis were using their civilian program
to actually develop nuclear weapons. As a result, IAEA
developed the additional protocols that they call the gold
standard. We have engaged in transfer of technology to the
Emirates in particular, and they in fact did adhere to the
gold standard. Do you believe that Saudi Arabia should also
adhere to the additional protocols?

Dr. Park: Senator, generally speaking, first and
foremost, in any of the nuclear weapons -- nuclear
technology transfer, we need to achieve the highest
standards when it comes to the nonproliferation from host
countries. Having said that, we need to be realistic and
practical to make sure that we get to provide the leadership
in actually overseeing some of these operations, mainly
because there are other countries, as you know, that can
provide similar technologies to Saudi Arabia or other
countries that may be interested in nuclear reactors, for
example.

This is critical. That’s the only way we can actually
provide assurances to our leadership and protect the United
States and our allies and partners.

Senator Reed: But it strikes me that we’ve already
entered into an arrangement with the Emiratis, who are our
close colleagues in everything we do in the Middle East. I
just got back from Jordan. They do, in fact, adhere to
these additional protocols. We insisted upon it, I think,
with the transfer. Why should we make the same insistence?
Because if we don’t, we’re lowering the threshold of
proliferation, even if it’s symbolically lowering it.

Dr. Park: So, Senator, from the technology standpoint,
we are actually improving constantly what we can do to
monitor and verify that they are complying. In terms of the
negotiation details, I don’t have any details at this point
in time.

Senator Reed: Thank you very much.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe: Senator Sullivan?

Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

To all the nominees, congratulations, and your families. I know it’s not always easy on the families, so I want to thank the families as well. We appreciate all of your desire to serve our nation in these important positions.

General Nakasone, I want to start with you. We’ve had a number of hearings in this committee on cyber strategy, or the lack thereof, which I think is probably the more pertinent issue. One of the things that’s come out -- and this is in the Obama Administration, the Trump Administration, civilians, military -- is that it’s been common knowledge, in open hearings by the way, that our adversaries who use cyber attacks against us clearly see that the benefits of doing these kind of attacks outweigh the costs, meaning that a pretty broad consensus is that we really haven’t retaliated hardly at all, whether it’s Iran, North Korea, Russia, China.

We had a hearing last year, about a year-and-a-half ago. General Clapper was on his way out as DNI. He publicly stated in an open hearing that the Chinese attack on the Office of Personnel Management, when they stole 22 million files -- I’m sure they stole yours and mine and
others who had SF-86s, 22 million -- and I asked him did we retaliate against China? He said no, no.

So can you give me your thoughts on this? We seem to be the cyber punching bag of the world, and it’s common knowledge. We have officials who have come before this committee in an open session saying nope, we get hit and we don’t retaliate. We don’t retaliate against the Russians, the North Koreans, the Chinese.

What’s your thought on that, and should we start cranking up the cost of the cyber attacks on our nation?

General Nakasone: Senator, I’d offer three thoughts to your question. The first thought is a strategy, a doctrine, critical for us to be able to set the framework not only for how we operate but also as a message to our adversaries as well.

Senator Sullivan: But do you think we have that right now? What do you think our adversaries think right now? If you do a cyber attack on America, what’s going to happen to them?

General Nakasone: Basically, I would say right now they do not think that much will happen to them.

Senator Sullivan: They don’t fear us.

General Nakasone: They don’t fear us.

Senator Sullivan: So, is that good?

General Nakasone: It is not good, Senator.
Senator Sullivan: So will you work to change that, if confirmed?

General Nakasone: Senator, if confirmed, and as the policy is worked, I would certainly provide input as an operational commander.

To my second point --

Senator Sullivan: By the way, I think you’d have broad-based support on this committee, Republicans and Democrats, if you said that, if that was part of your strategy.

General Nakasone: Secondly, Senator, what I would offer is that right now as this space develops, the cyberspace develops, the longer that we have inactivity, the longer our adversaries are able to establish their own norms, I think that is very, very important that we realize that.

And then the final piece I would offer is that we should always think of cyberspace not necessarily as only being a cyber response. We have tremendous capabilities in our nation. Being able to leverage those capabilities is something we should always think about.

Senator Sullivan: And maybe that’s overt, maybe that’s covert, but I would agree with you on that.

Well, I think we need guidance in terms of a broader cyber strategy, and if confirmed, we’re going to be relying
on you a lot for that. But I think deterrence has to be a key part of that.

Dr. Park, I want to turn to you. As you probably know, SOCOM recently took over the lead in the counter-WMD mission from STRATCOM. And as you know, the interagency cooperation with regard to this mission, which is probably, when you think about it, at least from my perspective, the most important mission that our U.S. military and interagency Federal officials undertake, do you think we have enough interagency cooperation within the counter-WMD mission? DOE obviously plays an important role.

And let me ask just another question that’s a little bit unrelated, but I want to get that in before I run out of time. Given the recent news that North Korea was able to proliferate chemical weapons technology and chemical weapons to Syria, does it concern you that the North Koreans will use these same proliferation networks to potentially proliferate nuclear materials and technology?

So, two questions.

Dr. Park: Senator, on the last question first, it’s deeply disturbing. In fact, we’re very concerned about DPRK’s intent and past behavior in transferring technologies and selling technologies. If confirmed, the office I would be responsible for would be doing its very best to monitor the activities, especially when it comes to the nuclear
materials, but also when it comes to other supporting technologies that might be used.

Going back to your first question, we have a very robust engagement, interagency engagement amongst the different parties. Especially NNSA has been playing a very critical role in equipping Special Forces and other departments with the latest technologies. Although it would not be part of my office, within NNSA there is an office called N80, a counterterrorism office, and it does a fantastic job in terms of actually coordinating and sharing experiences. There are exercises that we undertake to make sure the responders are adequately trained. Yes, we need proof. Yes, we need more support.

Senator Sullivan: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe: Senator Peters?

Senator Peters: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you to our witnesses for being here today and your willingness to serve in these very, very important positions.

General Nakasone, I’d start with you. First off, I want to say I appreciated the opportunity to talk at length on some of these issues in my office. I appreciate that attention and, if confirmed, look forward to continuing to work very closely with you on some of the things that we
talked about.

The one issue in particular that we had a chance to
talk about was some of the recruiting challenges for cyber
professionals, and also the need to make sure that if we’re
dealing with a whole-of-government approach, that all
Federal agencies have the ability to have top-tier cyber
professionals. We talked about a possibility of having a
joint duty program, similar to the joint forces in the
military where different branches have an opportunity to see
how the different branches work so we don’t have silos
between different military services. The same could occur
for the civilian force as well.

I’m very involved in autonomous vehicles, as we talked
about in my office, so that’s certainly going to be critical
infrastructure as all of these cars are going to be
interconnected and they’re going to have to have expertise
at the Department of Transportation and at NHTSA that may
not have been at that level in the past but certainly they
could learn a great deal from interacting with the military
services and your command in particular.

If you could talk a little bit about how a joint
service program might work, how that’s something that might
add to our ability to have people kind of cross-pollinating
great ideas that they can bring back to their respective
agencies.
General Nakasone: Senator, thank you. When we think about cyberspace, a lot of times we think only of technology. But what underpins technology is our talent, and you hit the point in terms of being able to cross-pollinate this talent.

In the military we think about it in the active and the reserve component, but critically within our civilian force—20 percent of our teams are made up of civilians—the ability to go to other places to serve, to learn, to be able to experience this is very, very important to us. So as we look across agencies, as we look to bring greater partnerships amongst our agencies, I think joint duty programs would be an area that we certainly could explore based on the benefits to both organizations.

Senator Peters: I appreciate that. We also talked about how you were interested in bringing highly skilled individuals into the military, perhaps at a direct commission at a higher rank. I know there’s a pilot program that’s going forward that you have been involved with. Could you give us a sense of how that pilot program is going, and do you need any additional support from Congress to expand direct commissioning programs that would bring in highly trained cyber professionals, perhaps at a higher rank?

General Nakasone: Let me first begin with a thank you
to the committee for all the work that has been done to provide a number of different programs. You hit on the direct commissioning program, Scholarship for Service, advanced individual pay. These are all different elements that have been critical for us.

Specifically with regards to the direct commissioning program today, what we have seen in the Army is we need greater constructive credit. So if you are a high-end big data or forensics malware analyst, being able to get more credit for that service to bring you at a higher rank will allow us to probably bring in a higher level of talent.

This is an early program. We’ve started it roughly within the past 90 days. That’s the early results that we’ve seen, Senator.

Senator Peters: And finally, I was struck by a talk that you did in 2016 at which you discussed the very highly successful Army recruiting commercial that you termed a breadcrumb, where you challenged folks to solve a problem. Could you talk a little bit about that, and is that something that you think we should expand?

General Nakasone: The credit goes to the Army recruiting agencies that have done this. But our idea was let’s appeal to our young people in a way that they know that they should be experiencing what life is like for us. We hid a code in the commercial, and that code was if you
saw it allowed you to log on to a site, and it allowed you
to try to solve a puzzle.

We’ve had over 8 million people try to solve this
puzzle, and less than 100,000 have been able to do it. So
that’s the type of talent that we’re looking for, and that’s
the type of originality, that’s the type of action that we
think will attract our best and brightest to be part of our
force, to be part of the greater Department of Defense, to
be part of national service.

Senator Peters: Thank you.

Dr. Park, a question related to research and
development of technologies that will give us breakthroughs
in order to better identify potential violations of
treaties. And I’m thinking about the JCPOA in particular,
which allows the IAEA to use modern technologies, which is a
fairly open-ended concept. So over the next few years there
could be tremendous advances in our ability to detect
potential violations.

My question to you is do you agree that the NNSA has a
role in pushing for these breakthroughs, and what sort of
priority would you place on that, if confirmed?

Dr. Park: Senator, NNSA, especially out of the R&D
office within DNN, has been pushing the envelope on getting
the latest technologies incorporated into the sensors that
we use for proliferation detection, nuclear proliferation
detection, and we work closely with the military branches
and IC members. I’m confident that our continuing efforts
incorporating the latest and the greatest, using the
different types of materials, will actually make our
verification efforts more successful. So I appreciate your
support in the R&D area.

Senator Peters: Great. Thank you.
Senator Inhofe: Senator Sasse?
Senator Sasse: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Congratulations to you all. Thanks for your
willingness to serve.

General, you know that I’m a big fan of yours, and our
country is blessed to have you in this new role, so this
isn’t a hostile question to you. But I want to go back to
your exchange with Senator Sullivan. We’re 31 years into
cyber war, but we’re 4 years into regular attacks against
the United States, to which we publicly admit we don’t
respond, or we don’t respond in any way that’s sufficient to
change behavior.

Your exchange with Senator Sullivan is the most
important thing that will happen on Capitol Hill today. We
have hundreds of hearings around here. Eighty percent of
them are fake. Ninety percent of them are pointless. Lots
and lots of questions that we ask, and they all seem like
they’re equal because they’re questions and they go on and
on and senators pontificate.

What you just said was that you agree with Admiral Rogers, I think, right? Admiral Rogers earlier this week said Russia has not received any response from the U.S. sufficient to change their behavior. That’s what he said. Do you agree?

General Nakasone: It has not changed their behavior.

Senator Sasse: And three years ago at the OPM hack we had Obama intelligence chiefs up here, primarily before the Homeland Security Committee, and we asked them the exact same questions: Is there any response from the United States Government that’s sufficient to change the Chinese behavior? And they said absolutely not.

Do you think there’s any reason the Chinese should be worried about U.S. response at the present?

General Nakasone: Again, I think that our adversaries have not seen our response in sufficient detail to change their behavior.

Senator Sasse: So this is ultimately not the responsibility of uniformed military to bear the brunt of the, hopefully, rightful anger and ire of the American people, but their government is failing them. At the top, at the executive, and at the legislative level, we are not responding in any way that’s adequate to the challenge we face. We face in cyber war, if we’re just playing cyber
defense, we have an asymmetric threat against us because we’re the biggest, most advanced economy in the world, we have the most electronics, and 90 percent of our critical infrastructure is in the private sector. So we stand to absorb attack after attack after attack unless we have offensive cyber capabilities.

We do have the capabilities. The problem is not technical. But if we had the will and the strategy and adjacent to cyber response a sense that diplomatic tools and kinetic responses were all on the table. Why should the American people have any confidence in their government right now in the area of cyber war?

General Nakasone: Again, Senator, I would offer from my comments previously. We have to think of this broadly. How are we going to respond? It’s not necessarily always within the military or the cyber realm that we’re going to do it. But obviously, offering a response in terms of being able to -- an adversary to determine that this is a behavior that we don’t accept is important.

Senator Sasse: And again, let’s distinguish among three different groups that have culpability here. The NSA and CYBERCOM and DOD need to present options. We need to have a technically trained workforce that’s able to respond, and we need leadership that can be strategic enough to lay out a menu of options. But ultimately, the top of the
But if you were going to assess blame right now --
don’t put it on the legislature because somebody else will
ask you a hard question in response to that. But clearly,
the oversight in this body is woefully inadequate. But at
the top of the DOD world, and at the handoff to civilian
leadership, what does that conversation look like right now
where a menu of options is presented, and then what happens
next, and when will we be more urgent?

General Nakasone: Senator, you offer a number of
different questions that right now in my current role I
couldn’t give you an informed response. What I think has to
happen is, obviously if confirmed, I provide a series of
cyber and military options that’s considered by the
Secretary of Defense and ultimately the President. But this
is only a realm of one portion of our deterrence, and others
will have to bring the whole-of-government piece of what we
might offer, Senator.

Senator Sasse: When we’re in the classified space and
we talk about overmatch in every other domain, we know we’ve
got lots and lots of challenges. In the cyber space, are
our problems primarily technical, or are they primarily
strategic and will?

General Nakasone: Senator, I would offer that we have
a number of different capabilities, and I don’t think that our problems are either of those. I think that what we have to do is continue to determine what is the best way forward here, what fits within our national strategy, and then act on that, Senator.

Senator Sasse: I’m out of time. But again, I want to reiterate that our country is blessed to have you in this new role. You’re clearly going to be confirmed. Lots of people around here, including me, have great confidence in you. But I do want you to know, I think there is bubbling up in this body a little more seriousness about the urgency, and I hope that at DOD and at NSA we feel that urgency in response. Thank you, sir.

Senator Inhofe: Great statement, Senator.

Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I’ll start by asking all three of you the same two questions that I ask nominees to all of the committees on which I serve. The first question is -- these are just yes or no answers. I’ll start with Dr. Park, and then General Nakasone and Ms. White, to respond.

First question. Since you became a legal adult, have you ever made unwanted requests for sexual favors or committed any verbal or physical harassment or assault of a sexual nature?
Senator Hirono: Second question. Have you ever faced discipline or entered into a settlement related to this kind of conduct?

Dr. Park: No.

General Nakasone: No.

Ms. White: No.

Senator Hirono: Thank you.

General Nakasone, Admiral Rogers of Cyber Command testified before this committee earlier this week that the authority, and therefore the responsibility for preventing ongoing Russian interference with our upcoming elections, lies with the Department of Homeland Security, not with Cyber Command. Do you agree?

General Nakasone: Senator, as it is laid out today, the responsibility for the critical infrastructure of the electoral system does reside within the responsibility of DHS.

Senator Hirono: Just with the critical infrastructure?

General Nakasone: The electoral system as being part of that critical infrastructure.

Senator Hirono: So what about the content of various
kinds of misinformation that is promulgated by Russia to
interfere with our elections? Who has responsibility to
stop those?

General Nakasone: Again, Senator, in the construct
that we have today, the electoral system falls within the

Senator Hirono: So what I’m trying to get at is what
constitutes the electoral system. If the main
responsibility lies with Homeland Security and all of its
components relating to elections, then I just want to
clarify that that is not a responsibility that Cyber Command
has, in your understanding.

General Nakasone: That is my understanding. It begins
with the states, who have overall responsibility for their
electoral process, and then falls within DHS as the overall
critical infrastructure lead for that area.

Senator Hirono: So in your view, the Department of
Homeland Security is the appropriate department to ask
questions about what they are doing to prevent the
continuing Russian attacks on our elections, of all the
departments that we could ask that question of?

General Nakasone: Certainly, Senator, they do have the
lead for that.

Senator Hirono: Thank you.

Now, you’ve been asked some questions about our non-
response to various cyber attacks, and particularly the
state-sponsored cyber attacks. So where does the
responsibility lie to develop a whole-of-government strategy
to respond to cyber attacks, particularly state-sponsored
cyber attacks?

General Nakasone: An overall strategy, Senator, I
would offer would emanate from the executive branch. In
terms of what the Department of Defense would do, obviously,
is plan for certain responses and, if directed, conduct
those activities.

Senator Hirono: So when you say the executive branch,
do you mean the President of the United States should be the
person that convenes all of you to develop a whole-of-
government strategy as to how to respond to these ongoing
cyber attacks, particularly the state-sponsored cyber
attacks?

General Nakasone: Obviously, the National Security
Council, Senator, would probably be the lead that would do
that today.

Senator Hirono: Do you know if that’s what’s happening
right now, that they are taking the lead to develop such a
strategy? Because we do not see it.

General Nakasone: Senator, in my current
responsibilities, it’s not something that I’m aware of
today, but if confirmed it’s certainly something that I
Senator Hirono: That’s good.

When Admiral Rogers was here, there were some questions as to what he would consider to be priorities that he would advise his successor -- that would be you -- to address, and I wanted to follow up with you.

If confirmed, what is number one on your list of priorities for CYBERCOM to accomplish under your leadership?

General Nakasone: Senator, it begins with readiness.

We’ve built a force now, 133 teams. These teams are approaching the full build. So we have to be able to measure their readiness, can they do their mission, are their personnel, equipment, training right that they can continue to do their missions in the future. I think this readiness element is the number-one priority that I would look at, Senator.

Senator Hirono: Since my time is running out, I’m probably going to want to follow up with you because there are all kinds of issues relating to this, and this is also for Dr. Park, because you have a lot of retirements happening in your bailiwick, soon to be. So I’m really concerned about how you’re going to ensure that you get the right kind of people. Particularly, Dr. Park, you said that you would ensure that you get the best and the brightest, and I don’t know how you’re going to ensure that when we
have competition for the best and brightest talent from the private sector.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you.

Senator Perdue?

Senator Perdue: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

General, congratulations on your nomination, and thank you for the time we personally spent earlier this week. I’m very impressed with your record. Thank you so much for your decades of service, sir.

I have a question on organization. In late August -- and we talked briefly about this -- President Trump announced that the Cyber Command would be elevated to a unified command. But we know that Section 1642, the 2017 NDAA, is clear that it would only be executed once the Pentagon studied the split from NSA and certified it would not pose, and I quote, “an unacceptable risk to the mission.”

What’s your opinion coming into this job, and how will you help us? Will you make a recommendation about that possibility of splitting NSA and Cyber Command, or is that something you already have an opinion on?

General Nakasone: Senator, I don’t have a predisposed opinion on this. I think we begin with the question: What’s best for the nation? And I think that’s critical for
us to consider. Is it best for the nation that the National
Security Agency and U.S. Cyber Command stay together under
one leader? Or is it time now that we think about a
separate National Security Agency and a separate combatant
command?

The Congress has laid out a series of conditions upon
which both the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman must
attest to. If it’s to split, I would imagine, if confirmed,
that among the early things that I would do is make that
assessment and in the first 90 days provide that to the
Secretary of Defense for his consideration, and the Director
of National Intelligence.

Senator Perdue: Thank you, sir. Let’s also talk about
with regard to the first 90 days. At some point in a
classified environment, I would personally like to see the
committee have you come back and talk about the menu of
options that you will provide to the President once you get
to that point, the potential menu of options for deterrence
and for measured response.

One of the questions we have right now before Admiral
Rogers was here earlier is the definition of an act of war.
In cyberspace, I’m not comfortable that we have today a
clear understanding of what constitutes an act of war, and
there are people who have testified before this committee
that have said when we look back upon this time and the
actions taken by some of these near-peer competitors out there, and others, that some of these actions will rise to the level that will be defined as an act of war. Do you agree with that?

General Nakasone: Senator, as we think about an act of war and we think about response, ultimately this is a policy decision upon which civilian leadership will make that determination. In terms of what I see my role would be, if confirmed, that is to provide a series of options capabilities for civilian leaders to consider to utilize or not utilize in the future.

Senator Perdue: And my last question goes to the organization of services within the military, the integration with corporate America, and integration with the government. When we look at DOD, DHS, FBI, in your mind coming into this job, one of the challenges I think you’re going to have, with the technology rapidly growing, is how do we leverage our position here in limited resources from the human capital point of view using technology to stand up to the pressures and the quantum leaps that we see our near competitors realizing today?

So the question is, how do we prepare for that? Does artificial intelligence, does technology, do robotics or some of these technological developments allow us to develop the same sort of leadership role or create a delta between
our capabilities and our competitors, like we have in the kinetic world?

General Nakasone: Senator, your question strikes at a chord for me because I think it talks to our national defense strategy, which really emphasizes partnerships and alliances. What we have learned in the Department of Defense, and particularly within the Army, is the fact that to stay abreast of what’s going on in the technology sphere, you have to look broader than your service, you have to look broader than the services.

So partnerships that we have been able to utilize with Defense Digital Service or Defense Innovation Unit experiment have been extremely powerful for us to get a better feel for what’s going on in the private world where all this technology explosion is taking place, expose our soldiers and civilians to that, provide an ability for them to leverage that, and also for private industry to understand that the talent that we have here and the missions that we’re working here are critically important for the security of our nation.

Senator Perdue: So you agree that competing hacker to hacker, so to speak, is not a strategy that will win against someone like the People’s Republic of China, and that technology is going to have to play a role in it.

The Defense Innovation Board concluded late last year
some similar findings, they presented some of the similar
findings. My question is do you agree with that? And then
two, how do we assure that the individual services all have
a similar level of proficiency as they develop their own
individual capability? And in your role, will you help
coordinate that?

General Nakasone: So, Senator, to your first question,
I do agree with the idea that we have to leverage
technology. This is not a heavy, labor-intensive country.
We’ve always leveraged technology for our benefit.

In terms of how we do this across the services, there
are wonderful ideas that are in the Navy, the Air Force, the
Army, the Marines on doing this. I think one of the roles
that I would play, if confirmed, is to make sure that we
have a very, very high bar for innovation, that we have a
very, very high bar for those unique individuals that can
play a critical role in developing the technologies that our
nation will need in the future.

Senator Perdue: Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator Perdue. Let me ask
you a question. Are you able to stay for a few minutes and
preside while I go? Thank you very much.

Senator Perdue presiding.

Senator Gillibrand?
Senator Gillibrand: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Nakasone, when we spoke yesterday, I asked you to look into this issue of the 13 Russians who have been indicted by the Department of Justice. Obviously, the military and the entire country considers election infrastructure critical infrastructure, and I know you’ve already answered my colleagues that your job as Commander of Cyber Command is to give the President options but not to create policy, and I also understand that you agreed with some of the testimony of Admiral Rogers yesterday that we aren’t doing quite enough to prevent.

One of the things we raised yesterday was about the National Guard potentially bridging the gap in authorities and jurisdictions between an attack on our country and systems that are operated at the state and local level. Do you see a potential role for the Guard in addressing this issue?

General Nakasone: So again, Senator, coming back to it, if this is the policy decision and what’s laid out in terms of what we will follow, I’m certain that the National Guard and working within that construct could be of assistance.

Senator Gillibrand: Yesterday we also spoke about how to build and retain a cyber mission force that addresses our strategic needs. In our Personnel Subcommittee, we are
currently looking at whether our cyber force should be approached different from other communities in the military. From your experience as Army Cyber, what do you think the services and Cyber Command could be doing to develop and retain this workforce, and how could we better use the Reserve component to develop an agile workforce?

General Nakasone: So, Senator, I can speak to the first part of your question on what the services might do from my own experiences within the Army. There were true critical decisions that the previous Chief of Staff for the Army made. One was to develop a schoolhouse, but the second one was to develop a branch, a cyber branch. Why is that so critical? Because young people can come in and understand that they will work cyber their entire career. Someday they’ll come as a second lieutenant and rise all the way to commanding Army Cyber. I think that’s a critical piece, and I think that as we mature across the Department that’s one that will be looked at very carefully.

In terms of the second piece with regard to what we might do to continue to attract people to join and stay within our force, the work that the committee has done to date to offer incentives, to offer capabilities for us to pay for certain skills like computer languages, forensics and malware, and tool development, critical to what we’re doing, to look at direct commissioning, to look at other
1 programs such as graduate school or scholarship for service, 
2 these are all individual programs that collectively show a 
3 dynamic element of our force that I think is very, very 
4 attractive to our young people.

Senator Gillibrand: Now I’d like to ask Ms. Anne Marie 
6 White. The Office of Environmental Management’s mission 
7 includes managing radioactive waste. Therefore, I want to 
8 ask you about the nearly 150 shipments of high-level liquid 
9 nuclear waste from Canada that is being trucked through 
10 Buffalo and Syracuse, New York, to Savannah in South 
11 Carolina. The agency you hope to lead approved these 
12 shipments based on data showing that trucking solid nuclear 
13 waste can be done safely. However, this waste is in liquid 
14 form.

15 If, God forbid, there is an accident with just one 
16 truck and a single drop gets into a city’s water supply, it 
17 could completely destroy it; whereas if powder spilled, it 
18 could be retrieved with limited contamination. I am 
19 seriously concerned that the Office of Environmental 
20 Management approved these transports, and I’m concerned that 
21 the communities through which this waste may transit are not 
22 fully informed and won’t know how to handle a spill.

23 Don’t you think that before DOE transports liquid 
24 nuclear waste for the first time, we and the surrounding 
25 communities should be fully prepared and ready to handle any
potential spills?

Ms. White: I have not been fully briefed on that particular issue, but I can share with you that in my experience stakeholder engagement, stakeholder outreach, all of these things are fundamentally important to our ability to complete our mission safely and cost effectively, and I can commit to you that I will work closely with your staff, this committee, and all the interested stakeholder parties, because communication on these issues is very, very important.

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you. Do you agree that the properties of solid substances are different than those of liquid substances? And if you do, do you think that these shipments should be halted until DOE completes a new environmental impact statement that takes into account the properties of liquid nuclear waste?

Ms. White: So, there is a difference between liquid and solid. I agree with that, absolutely. What I can commit to you is that, if confirmed, I will look into this issue, get a better understanding of the pathway so far and the path forward, and keep you informed.

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

Dr. Park, one of the primary responsibilities of the Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation is to lead DNN as it works to prevent nuclear and radiologic
proliferation and terrorism threats worldwide. In January, President Trump waived sanctions on Iran under the JCPOA but threatened not to do the same again unless Congress put forth legislation to rewrite the agreement to meet his list of demands.

If the U.S. were to pull out of the JCPOA, how would that impact international nuclear safety and worldwide nonproliferation efforts?

Dr. Park: Senator, keeping the region safe is one of the key challenges for not only the U.S. but for its allies and partners; in fact, globally, and doing everything that we can. Out of the DNN office we have a very specific challenge in providing the latest and the greatest technologies to make sure we know what they’re doing, and we are ready to partner with the other stakeholders, closely supporting State Department colleagues. But again, we are ready to provide the best technologies to do our part at NNSA.

Senator Perdue: [presiding] On behalf of Senator Inhofe, Senator Graham?

Senator Graham: Thank you.

Mr. Park, you mentioned in your opening testimony -- and I think you’re very qualified for your job, so congratulations on the nomination -- that one of the goals is to make sure we do not proliferate nuclear weapons or
materials. Is that correct?

Dr. Park: Yes, Senator.

Senator Graham: Are you aware of an agreement between
the United States and Russia entered into in the early 2000s
where we would dispose of 34 metric tons of excess weapons-
grade plutonium, and they would do the same?

Dr. Park: Yes, Senator.

Senator Graham: Okay. And under that agreement -- and
that’s enough weapons-grade plutonium to make well over
10,000 warheads. Are you aware of that?

Dr. Park: Yes, Senator.

Senator Graham: Okay. Under that agreement, the
United States was going to convert their weapons-grade
plutonium into MOX steel, turn a sword into a plowshare.
Are you familiar with that program?

Dr. Park: Yes, I’m aware.

Senator Graham: And the Russians were going to dispose
of their 34 metric tons through a fast breeder reactor. Is
that correct?

Dr. Park: Yes.

Senator Graham: In 2001 we entered into that
agreement. Are you aware of that?

Dr. Park: Yes.

Senator Graham: In 2007, construction of the MOX
facility began. Are you aware of that?
Dr. Park: Yes.

Senator Graham: In 2010, there was an amendment to the original agreement where we would provide $400 million to support Russian plutonium disposition and reaffirmed our decision to turn our weapons-grade plutonium into MOX steel. You’re aware of that?

Dr. Park: Yes.

Senator Graham: Are you aware that there’s a MOX field plant in France?

Dr. Park: Yes, I’m aware.

Senator Graham: And this is where you take weapons-grade plutonium, dilute it down, and make it commercial fuel. Is that correct?

Dr. Park: One of the options, yes.

Senator Graham: Okay. But the agreement was between us and Russia, reaffirmed in 2010.

In 2014, the Obama Administration made the decision to stop the MOX program and put it in cold standby status. Are you familiar with that?

Dr. Park: Some theories thereof, Senator.

Senator Graham: Yes. Well, and Congress rejected that by funding $345 million for continued MOX construction.

So here is my question to you. Will you go to Savannah River site and come back and tell this committee how much of the plan is completed, in your opinion?
Dr. Park: If confirmed, I will make that one of the highest priorities in my early stages.

Senator Graham: All right. The people on the ground at Savannah River site say it’s nearly 70 percent complete, and I’ll show it to you.

The Russians have basically withdrawn from this agreement. Is that correct?

Dr. Park: Yes. They suspended it two years ago.

Senator Graham: And the reason they suspended it, for the committee, is that we changed our decision to dispose of plutonium through the MOX program to dilute and dispose, which would put it in New Mexico, and the Russians said that was not the deal.

Have you talked to the New Mexico delegation about whether or not they would receive this material?

Dr. Park: I’m not at a point where I can actually have that type of conversation.

Senator Graham: All right. Well, they haven’t -- I would urge you to do that. I would also urge you to listen to what the contractor can do to make the MOX program cheaper and more efficient. I would like for you to get back with me about the viability of an alternative to dilute and dispose. Would you do that?

Dr. Park: If confirmed.

Senator Graham: Okay, thank you.
Do you agree with me that this agreement to dispose of 34 metric tons of weapons-grade plutonium was an historic nonproliferation agreement?

Dr. Park: It was certainly one of the most important events, yes.

Senator Graham: I would say it’s the most important that I know of, and it would be in our interest to maintain this agreement, if possible. Do you agree with that?

Dr. Park: Yes.

Senator Graham: Okay. Since you’re in charge of nonproliferation, that’s a good answer.

[Laughter.]

Senator Graham: So, what I’d like you to do is report back to the committee can we do it cheaper, is the contractor willing to give maybe a fixed-price contract, how much of the program is actually complete in your estimation, is the dilute and dispose option viable, how much does it cost, what kind of laws would you have to change to make sure that happened, and could they be changed? In other words, give me a reasoned response to a new plan. Would you agree to do that?

Dr. Park: If confirmed, I’ll do my best.

Senator Graham: All right. Thank you. I’m sure you will, and I think you’re very qualified.

To the committee, we’ve talked about this a lot. I
cannot believe that we’re going to change course when the facility is 70 percent complete, pick up a new idea that’s been poorly vetted, if vetted at all, walk away from an agreement that would dispose of plutonium on both sides, Russia and the United States, that could create 10,000 more heads if not disposed of without thinking this through, and I appreciate what this committee has done to reject this arbitrary decision to stop production and construction. So, thank you, Mr. Park, look forward to working with you.

Dr. Park: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Perdue: On behalf of Senator Inhofe, Senator King.

Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to pick up from Senator Sasse and Senator Sullivan. Our entire defense enterprise is designed for peace. It’s designed to preserve the peace and deter war. History tells us that the surest way to war is to not be prepared. John F. Kennedy wrote his senior thesis at Harvard in 1940 called “While England Slept,” and it was an analysis of England’s feckless non-preparation during the ’30s in the face of the German buildup of their war machine and how that, in fact, in effect, encouraged Hitler to pursue his aggressive policies, which led to the deaths of 55 million people over the course of the next five years.
We are either at war now or on the brink of war, and the war is in cyber, and it’s a multi-front war, and it’s a complex war. As my colleagues have pointed out, we don’t have a strategy for dealing with that war, and especially we don’t have a strategy for deterring that war.

Back when I was a kid, the motto of the Strategic Air Command was “Peace is Our Profession,” because we had those airplanes and those bombs in order to preserve the peace, to deter aggression. In fact, the deterrence theory kept us out of a nuclear war, an unthinkable nuclear war for some 75 years.

My concern now is -- and I realize, General Nakasone, you’re the operational guy. But we’ve got to confront this issue, and this isn’t a criticism of the current administration. The prior administration did not confront it either. As has been pointed out repeatedly today, we are under attack, and our adversaries feel no consequences. They fear no results. They fear no response. And until we deal with that, we are going to continue to be under attack, and what concerns me is that the attacks are going to escalate, and at the time we see a devastating attack on our energy system, our financial system, our electrical grid, it’s going to be, then, too late, because we are going to be severely damaged in this country not only through cyber but the physical consequences will be catastrophic.
So I hope that when you are confirmed, and I believe you will be, that you will carry this message into the highest councils of the United States Government. In fact, under an amendment passed to the National Defense Act in 2017, you are charged with a partial responsibility to report to the Secretary of Defense to develop just the kind of strategy and doctrine that we’re talking about.

I don’t have the Secretary of Defense sitting where you are today. I don’t have the President sitting where you are today. So you are bearing the brunt of this message. But there could not be, as Senator Sasse said, be a more important issue before this body, and I hope that you will take upon yourself the responsibility not simply to be the person who executes policy but the person who assists in the formation of policy. As a warrior, you know best the power and importance of deterrence and that this is at the essence of our entire defense enterprise.

Will you carry that message back with some passion, General?

General Nakasone: Senator, if confirmed, I certainly will.

Senator King: I believe that there can be no more important aspect of your job. There are plenty of other aspects of the job, and we’ve talked about them today -- when to split the two agencies, when to change the two-hat
arrangement. But I just can’t stress enough how important this is, because as long as we maintain a strictly defensive posture, we are inviting aggression, and that aggression is going to continue. We saw it in 2016. It’s going to continue both in the realm of our democracy and our political system, but it’s also going to continue in other ways as well. So I deeply hope that you will make that part of your mission when you’re confirmed.

One thing that I hope you will get back to us on -- and this is a different subject, and this would be subsequent to your confirmation, perhaps in the first six months or so -- is an analysis or a report to us on the issues of recruitment and retention in both Cyber Command and NSA. This is an area where people are the most important asset, and I fear that, for a number of reasons, whether it’s the slowness of the clearance process, whether it’s the way the bureaucracy works, we’re not going to be able to recruit and retain the crucial people that we need. Do you believe this is part of what you’re going to pursue?

General Nakasone: I shall, Senator, if confirmed.

Senator King: Thank you.

Dr. Park, I appreciate your work. I’m over time, but I certainly believe we face serious proliferation risks, particularly in North Korea, Iran. Pakistan, I think, is of concern. You’re coming into this job at a crucial period,
and I’m delighted with your background and qualifications and hope you will pursue it relentlessly.

Dr. Park: Will do, Senator.

Senator King: Thank you, Dr. Park.

Senator Perdue: On behalf of Senator Inhofe, Senator Cruz?

Senator Cruz: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your service and your testimony.

General Nakasone, in your judgment, what do you see as the greatest cyber terrorism or cyber security threats that we’re facing right now?

General Nakasone: Certainly, Senator, the discussions we’ve had this morning with regards to the challenges, the vulnerabilities within our critical infrastructure are among the top concerns that I have.

Senator Cruz: Some time ago, I chaired a hearing in the Science and Space Subcommittee of the Commerce Committee on artificial intelligence. It was the first congressional hearing on artificial intelligence. We heard testimony at that hearing that one of the real threats as AI expands and as more and more decision-making is done in sector after sector of the economy through AI that cyber terrorism would occur, hacking into a big data dataset, not denying service, not bringing the system down, but far more subtly, simply
changing the data in the big data dataset so the AI
algorithms reached the wrong results.

How serious do you assess threats of that kind, and
what can be done to secure against them?

General Nakasone: So, Senator, previously we thought
only of securing our networks, and what we have certainly
learned is the fact that securing our data, which I would
say is the coin of the realm -- our data is critical. Think
of the dangers that are posed if our data is manipulated,
whether or not it's in our financial, our health, our
national defense records, very critical for what we're
doing. But also think of the security of our weapons
systems that go with it, the code that underlies our
platforms, the code that underlies the critical capabilities
that our Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines rely on.

In terms of what must be done, I would offer that we
have to think more broadly in terms of a defense in-depth
strategy as we look to the future. You highlighted the
challenges of AI. Just as critical as AI might be for a
terrorist, it's critical for us to be able to verify code or
to be able to have the capability to verify the integrity of
our data.

So I do see this as one of the areas that both has
tremendous positive impacts for our nation but one that we
must be able to understand the limitations and the
consequences as well.

Senator Cruz: One of the challenges the services have faced over time is attracting a talent pool with the expertise, with the background to compete and compete effectively on a global stage, particularly when you’re competing with companies in Silicon Valley that can offer mountains of money.

What can and should we be doing better to ensure that we have the top talent working to secure us from cyber threats?

General Nakasone: Senator, I think it’s important that we play to our strengths. The number-one strength that I have found in Army Cyber is emphasizing our mission. We have a unique mission. There’s no one in the private sector that has the responsibility for defending the nation. We have a very, very unique mission, and I think that resonates with young people today.

But I also think we have to have an approach to recruiting people that is dynamic, that tries different ideas, that has unique partnerships, that is able to leverage ideas that may not be traditional within our military sphere, and I think that’s important because the space that we operate in is changing every single day. So why shouldn’t our ideas change just as rapidly?

Senator Cruz: Let’s talk a moment about international
corporate espionage. I recently met with a CEO of a major Texas company who described significant concerns about researchers who were Chinese nationals working with the firm and potentially stealing American intellectual property, and what they were finding is that their research midway through suddenly became the subject of Chinese patent applications, and the CEO I think has significant concerns that that’s a direct act of corporate espionage.

How serious do you assess that threat, and what can be done to stop state actors from targeting American businesses and companies?

General Nakasone: Senator, I have recently read a lot of material with regards to espionage and the stealing of our secrets. One area that we’re very, very focused on is the defense industrial base. We are concerned. We should be concerned based upon what our adversaries have planned and what they’ve been able to do in the past.

We have to look at a more comprehensive approach to securing it. What are the responsibilities of the private sector? What needs to be written into a contract? What do we need to do to ensure the integrity of the networks and the data that are out there? These are all elements of what I would say is a very, very important strategy that we must pursue.

Senator Cruz: And one final question, if I may, for
Nuclear proliferation remains a serious threat. How seriously do you assess the threat of North Korean proliferation to Iran or to other hostile actors, and what should we be doing to prevent that?

Dr. Park: On a scale of 1 to 10, probably 11. This is one of those important challenges that we have to work with international partners to address. It’s both regional, but it’s got global implications, and we need to do everything possible to contain the situation and reverse their nuclear development efforts.

Senator Cruz: Thank you.

Senator Inhofe: [presiding] Thank you, Senator.

Senator Blumenthal: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

I thank all three of you for your service to our nation.

General, when I questioned Admiral Rogers -- and I join you in saluting his service to our nation -- about the indictment that was returned just a couple of weeks ago against 13 Russians and three Russian entities, he professed that he had not read it, or at least as of that time had not read it. When you and I spoke yesterday, you indicated that you have read it. I think you would join me in the view that it is profoundly alarming and chilling as a picture of
Soviet warfare -- I’m sorry, Russian warfare against the United States in the style of the Cold War as conducted by the Soviet Union. They sent spies, in effect, to this country who traveled freely. They hired thousands of experts in the Internet agency, the Internet Research Agency that they built, they spent millions of dollars through Russian oligarchs who are associates of Vladimir Putin. They called it “informational warfare.” They used the term “warfare.”

Would you agree with me that that kind of attack on our nation is an act of war?

General Nakasone: Senator, as we consider an act of war, at the end that is a policy decision. I would offer that in terms of if I was confirmed, what I would need to do is offer a series of options of capabilities that senior policymakers might consider in terms of responding or not responding.

Senator Blumenthal: And what kind of response is appropriate to that kind of information warfare? Isn’t some kind of response necessary in the cyber domain?

General Nakasone: As we consider a response, obviously the decision rests with the executive branch and/or Congress in terms of what that response will be. Whether or not we respond in the cyber domain or another domain, I think the most important thing is we want the behavior to change.
1 Senator Blumenthal: We want them to pay a price.

2 General Nakasone: We want them to pay a price. We

3 want the behavior to change.

4 Senator Blumenthal: And Admiral Rogers admitted freely

5 that their behavior is not changing right now, in essence

6 because they are paying no cost for this kind of continued

7 meddling in our democratic process. Would you agree?

8 General Nakasone: Certainly, and that corresponds with

9 what the Director of National Intelligence has recently said

10 in open testimony as well, Senator.

11 Senator Blumenthal: So you would agree.

12 General Nakasone: Yes.

13 Senator Blumenthal: Let me ask Dr. Park, in your

14 responsibilities for preventing and reversing proliferation

15 of weapons of mass destruction, your responsibilities would

16 include chemical weapons. As you know, Syria recently

17 conducted a chemical weapons attack that seriously harmed

18 and probably killed a number of its own people. On

19 Wednesday the New York Times reported on a yet-to-be-

20 released United Nations report that links North Korea’s

21 shipments of supplies to Russia that can be used for its

22 production of chemical weapons.

23 I’m going to ask that that article be made a part of

24 the record.

25 Senator Inhofe: Without objection.
[The information referred to follows:]
Senator Blumenthal: Do you believe that the continued use of chemical weapons in Syria poses a threat to our service members there? And do you believe we have to take action against both Syria and North Korea if the equipment and instruments and supplies are being supplied by North Korea to Syria?

Dr. Park: Senator, in terms of what we should do in terms of taking any actions, that’s up to the appropriate entities within the government.

On the use of chemical weapons, it’s a serious concern.

Senator Blumenthal: Well, will you recommend action that can be taken against North Korea?

Dr. Park: We will provide as much information and data available for the decision-makers to use to take appropriate actions. The DNN does provide information related to smuggling efforts throughout the world by working with our international partners, and to that extent we will collect and process the advice of the decision-makers.

Senator Blumenthal: Well, I’m concerned that I’m not hearing from you the same alarm about Syria using chemical weapons as you expressed in your advance policy questions about ISIS using chemical weapons.

Dr. Park: My only constraint is because of the role that I would be having, it’s not related to actually what I call actionable side of what the U.S. Government might do.
with this type of information. But I do share your concerns to the highest degree possible.

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you.

Senator Cotton?

Senator Cotton: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all.

General, I want to speak at a high level about the threats we face from emerging technologies, especially from China. Winston Churchill said once that the fate of the world would have been very different in 1945 if the Soviet Union had held a nuclear monopoly and not the United States. Rather than use nuclear weapons to end World War II and then to extend the security umbrella around the rest of the world, the Soviet Union would have used that weapon to dominate, subjugate, or annihilate its adversaries.

His point there was that there are certain kinds of technologies that are so revolutionary, so breakthrough that there really is no effective counter if you don’t have the immediate technology in hand. Some you can fight back against.

So, for instance, in 1939-1940, when the Finns were fighting off the Soviet Union, they had very few, if any, anti-armor weapons. They invented the Molotov cocktail,
named sarcastically after the Soviet foreign minister.

That’s just what it is. The Molotov cocktail was thrown into the exhaust of a Soviet tank. The point that Churchill made, though, is that the nuclear weapon that the United States had perfected and the Soviet Union did not was so radically different that if the Soviet Union had had it, they would have used it to either subjugate or annihilate the rest of their adversaries.

Looking at artificial intelligence and quantum computing, how would you rank that threat to the United States? And if perfected by our adversaries before we have it, especially China, is it more like an incremental breakthrough or a novel innovation like the tank or like precision-guided munitions, or is it more like nuclear technology?

General Nakasone: Simply put, Senator, I would characterize it as what you may roughly know as a revolution in military affairs. I mean, this is a game-changer for our adversaries if they get to artificial intelligence, if they get to quantum computing before we’re there. This is why it’s so critical that we continue our research, continue our work towards it, continue our applications.

Senator Cotton: Is it the kind of thing, though, that if you had a breakthrough -- again, the breakthrough would likely come from China -- that it would either substantially
impair or even completely over-match our other advantages in
the air and space, in the maritime domain, or in the nuclear
domain? It would essentially neutralize those advantages
that we have against a threat like China?

General Nakasone: I think also, Senator, to agree with
your statement, I think it would also provide a capability
for their economic element that would be incredibly powerful
that would certainly give them a leap ahead.

Senator Cotton: So that would be a very bad thing.

What would be your main suggestions to ensure that does not
happen, that we don’t let China race ahead of us in the
struggle to master artificial intelligence and quantum
computing?

General Nakasone: We must continue our research, we
must continue our funding of it, we must continue the
development of our young people for science, technology,
engineering, mathematics. Those are all elements that I
think are important, to include the work that’s being done
today by others in the private sector to raise concern and
to raise awareness of what needs to be done.

Senator Cotton: How can you, presuming your
confirmation, compete with the American private sector and
China, whether it’s the so-called private sector or their
government-sponsored enterprises, for the very best talent?
Obviously, you can’t pay nearly as much as what private-
sector employers in the United States can pay or what the Chinese government is willing to pay to master this technology. So how can you compete to make sure you get the very best talent, which in this domain is probably the number-one asset?

General Nakasone: Senator, I think it begins with, again, emphasizing the mission. What is of appeal that you would want to work at a place like the National Security Agency or U.S. Cyber Command? It’s the defense of the nation.

And then I think the second piece of it is you have to have the outreach. Where is this research taking place? Where are the academic breakthroughs happening? How do we make sure that we have a presence there?

And the third point is obviously to be able to cultivate that talent. It’s not that we need everybody, but we need the top talent that’s willing to come and to work on these very, very important missions for our nation.

Senator Cotton: Okay. Thank you, General. We’ll have time in the future at the Intelligence Committee as well, but I do want to say here in this public setting that one very important part of the mission at the NSA that I hope you’ll prioritize is the protection of our own systems and our own information against the loss to malevolent actors, either through negligence or through espionage. Thank you.
Senator Inhofe: Senator Warren?

Senator Warren: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to our witnesses for your willingness to serve.

General Nakasone, the organization you were nominated to lead, Cyber Command, was given the job of countering ISIS efforts to use the Internet to recruit, to spread its ideology, to move money, to coordinate its forces. Former Deputy Secretary of Defense Bob Work described CYBERCOM’s efforts to stop ISIS as “dropping cyber bombs.” And judging by public reporting, we were at least somewhat successful in this effort.

But while we were focused on ISIS, Russia was using this same technology to undermine our democracy here at home. From what I understand, this was not an especially expensive or technologically sophisticated effort. It was a unit of hackers that were amplified by a troll factory in Moscow. And yet, U.S. defenses were totally inadequate.

General, what can we learn from our operations against ISIS that we can apply to efforts to protect and defend against Russian style cyber attacks moving forward?

General Nakasone: The first thing I would offer, Senator, what we have learned in the battle against ISIS is that rapidly you have to be able to change your methodologies. We started slow against ISIS and didn’t have
a lot of tremendous success early on. But then the momentum picked up as we continued to operate in cyberspace, understand the intelligence, understand the targeting, understand the capabilities that had to be developed.

The second thing that I would offer, Senator, that I have personally learned is the power of information. How do you provide impact to an adversary that no longer holds geographic terrain? It’s a messaging component that we were able to work, particularly in support of U.S. Central Command and U.S. Operations Command, the task force. But bringing this ability to amplify a message to an adversary is able to counteract what they’re able to do.

Senator Warren: Thank you, General. You know, it’s deeply disturbing that you start your answer by saying it’s important that we act with speed when we’re sitting here more than a year after it has become widely known that Russia hacked into American election systems to try to influence the election and we still have not taken aggressive action.

I understand that the Department of Homeland Security is the lead agency for election security. But, General, if confirmed, you will command the most elite cyber security professionals in our government, and a key part of your mission will be to defend the United States and its interests against cyber attacks of significant consequence.
As a result, I’m concerned that an attack on our democratic processes meets this definition of significant. So, General, if confirmed, what are you prepared to do to make sure that the U.S. is prepared to defend against Russian style cyber attacks designed to interfere in the 2018 and 2020 elections?

General Nakasone: Senator, if confirmed, my initial actions would be what are the options that I might be able to provide to the Secretary of Defense and the President that might be utilized when a decision is made to counteract what an adversary has done to our nation.

Senator Warren: So you’re telling me we don’t even have a decision to respond yet? Is that what you just said?

General Nakasone: Senator, what I said is that in terms of being confirmed with regards to the authorities that I would have that are existing today would be to provide a series of actions upon which the Secretary of Defense or President could leverage in response to an adversary’s actions.

Senator Warren: Well, I think it’s clear that we need to be vigilant to prevent this from ever happening again. And if confirmed, we’re going to need you, General, to help lead this fight.

Let me ask one more question about cyber readiness. In the 2017 Defense authorization bill, this committee directed
the Pentagon to elevate Cyber Command as an independent, stand-alone command and gave you some unique service-like authorities to train and equip your own force. The only other combatant command that has similar authorities is the Special Operations Command. But it took SOCOM many years to grow that responsibility and to begin effectively executing on those authorities. Given the cyber threats that we face, General, I’m concerned that we don’t have the luxury of waiting years for CYBERCOM to be able to do the same.

So let me ask, if confirmed, what is your plan for maturing the CYBERCOM operation to accomplish the functions that the military services currently provide, and what does your timeline look like? I realize we’re out of time, but if he can have just a little bit to answer here.

General Nakasone: Senator, I think that we should begin with what have we learned from SOCOM in understanding how they’ve been able to utilize these service-like authorities. What are the things that we’d be able to transfer to U.S. Cyber Command, if confirmed, that I could leverage?

In terms of a timeline, I can’t give you a timeline in terms of my experience to date. That’s something I would say I would need to assess if confirmed, to come back and have that discussion with the committee.

Senator Warren: Well, I can’t underline the urgency of
the moment enough. We know that the Russians hacked us in
2016, and they’re coming back after us in 2018. We can’t
let the perfect be the enemy of the good here. We’ve got to
move.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you.

Senator Donnelly?

Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank all the families who are here with us
today, Dr. Park, Lieutenant General Nakasone, Ms. White.

General, it is quite clear to me that the Russians are
using cyberspace as a cheap and easy way to try and tear our
country apart. They worked really hard to disrupt our
elections in 2016, and they’re working just as hard to do it
again this upcoming November. Many sources, including the
Director of National Intelligence, the Commander of U.S.
Cyber Command, expect we’ll see continued cyber disruptions
not only of our elections but of our military, our IT, our
businesses, and our country.

The Russians are landing clean shots against us in
cyberspace, and we don’t seem to be on the field. So as we
look at this, not only are the Russians a concern but North
Korea, Iran, China, and other non-state actors like ISIS.

General Nakasone, if confirmed, how do you plan to
thwart these efforts? What is the battle plan to fight
back?

General Nakasone: So, Senator, in terms of a multitude of adversaries, I would begin with, if confirmed, we’d have to look at a series of options that would need to be developed. We are working now today --

      Senator Donnelly: Do you have any of that series of options lined up right now?

      General Nakasone: So, for some adversaries, yes, we do.

      Senator Donnelly: What options are we using against the Russians?

      General Nakasone: So, in this forum, given the nature of it, I’ll defer from that just given the unclassified element. But that’s one of the areas that I think Admiral Rogers spoke to on Tuesday that was being worked. In my current position, that’s not something that I’m responsible for at this time. But if confirmed, that’s obviously one of the early areas that I would look into.

      Senator Donnelly: Have you yet been instructed -- you haven’t been confirmed yet. Have you been instructed by anyone in regards to here’s the battle plan we’re looking to take against the Russians to move forward against them?

      General Nakasone: Senator, in my current position it is not one of the areas that I’m focused on at Army Cyber. I’d have to defer that to Admiral Rogers, the current
commander.

Senator Donnelly: Well, as we look at this, I want to ask you another question about plans to fight back against these threats, and that’s what we were talking about. Do you have any offensive plans that you’ve put together, not only thwarting the attack but going on offense? You’re not in the position yet, but have you started to put together any plans of your own from watching everything that’s gone on, to take the fight to them as opposed to just trying to play defense at every corner?

General Nakasone: Senator, we certainly have a series of offensive plans. I will not go into them here today, but there are plans that have been developed.

Senator Donnelly: Are we communicating clearly to our adversaries in a language that they understand that the costs of these actions will outweigh the benefits that they’re receiving? At this time, in the cost versus benefit analysis, I think it’s overwhelmingly on the benefit side for the Russians and for others. Has there been any effort to indicate to our adversaries, that you know of, that there will be costs, that the costs will be coming, that there is a plan, and that we plan to move forward with it?

General Nakasone: Senator, I know of no plan yet. But again, with my responsibilities, I would defer to others that are working on the Russian piece of it, sir.
Senator Donnelly: Do you know of any clear plan at the present time guiding how we respond to cyber attacks by the Russians or by anybody else, either nationally or within DOD?

General Nakasone: Senator, again, in my current responsibilities, not having the responsibility for Russia, I’m not aware of that, but that is one that should be asked of those who are working on it, Senator.

Senator Donnelly: Dr. Park, you have done many extraordinary things in your career. You’ve worked on nonproliferation. You’ve worked on nuclear disarmament. You met in the past with my predecessor, Senator Lugar, who has been such an extraordinary leader on this during his career here in the Senate. I mentioned to you that I visited a facility named after him in Tbilisi, in Georgia, trying to work on efforts to protect our country from the transmission of nuclear materials.

So the question I have for you, sir, is I’d like to get your thoughts on how to strengthen our nonproliferation and our nuclear deterrent efforts.

Dr. Park: So, Senator, quickly, I appreciate the support. Senator Lugar’s work has been the foundation for what we have today, and because of his leadership, we’re able to create the partnerships that are meaningful, international partners, and we can sustain, and at the same
time we continue to push the envelope of science and technology side of what we do. Verification is a key to nonproliferation efforts. You have to be able to verify, and we focus on the verification side of our business through R&D efforts. So we keep pushing that area.

Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, thank you, sir.

Senator Inhofe: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Reed, do you have any further comments?

Senator Reed: No, sir.

Senator Inhofe: All right.

Thank you very much, I say to our three witnesses. Ms. White, you got off pretty easy there.

We thank you very much for your patience and for your testimony and for what you’ve contributed to this nation so far.

And we are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:20 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]