

**Remarks and Q&A by the Director of the Open Source Center  
Mr. Douglas Naquin**

**ODNI Open Source Conference  
Washington, DC**

**July 16, 2007**

---

SABRA HORNE: Hello, ladies and gentlemen. Hope you all have had a great day so far, and before we get to our last speaker of the day, by no means the least, we have a few housekeeping things. Please remember to bring back your badges tomorrow because we don't have replacements, and also, we have a slight change to the schedule tomorrow. Our director, Director McConnell, will be 15 minutes later than planned. He will be speaking from 11:15 until 12 o'clock, and I'm quite sure he'll be worth the wait, so we'll look forward to seeing you then.

It is now my pleasure to introduce Mr. Doug Naquin, who is the Director of Open Source Center. Mr. Naquin was appointed director on November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2005, directly after the standup of the Open Source Center. He oversees the collection, analysis and dissemination of open source across the community. He began with the FBIS, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, back in 1979, when he was six years old. (Laughter.) He has had four overseas tours, including Asia, the Middle East and Latin America. He was the Deputy CIO for the CIA from 1999 until 2002 and has been a three-time winner of the Intelligence Commendation Medal. Mr. Naquin. (Applause.)

DOUGLAS NAQUIN: Good afternoon. Before I get started, I want to make three quick points. First, I am fully cognizant that I stand between you and whatever passes for a happy hour in the open source world – (laughter) – so I will try to keep my remarks within time. Second, I did not write Fran Townsend's speech, although – (laughter) – it would have been nice. And third, and most important, I wanted to thank the ADDNI for Open Source, Eliot Jardines, and his staff for putting on this conference. I have been in open source most of my career – that's five years old, not six – and never in my career lifetime would I see this level of participation and this level of interest in a conference, so I thank Eliot and his staff for their leadership in putting this on.

What I'm going to do is talk a little bit of history, recent. Following up on three recommendations out of the 74 put forth by the Robb-Silverman commission which is also known as the WMD commission, on 1 November 2005, the Director of National Intelligence established the DNI Open Source Center. I would offer that, for those who think nothing ever happens quickly in the U.S. government, the center was created just seven months after then-DNI Negroponte took office and used the commission's recommendations as a starting point for reforming the intelligence community. Within a month of the center's creation, we had our first Assistant Deputy DNI for Open Source, and we're on our way to building a national open source enterprise.

Now, you have many experts, customers and stakeholders here this week, and I will let them offer their views and experiences on the value of open sources. In my brief time, I would like to focus on our business model as a DNI center. I believe this model is unique in the intelligence community and perhaps in government and is tailored to the attributes and comparative advantages of exploiting open source information to support those who make and execute U.S. national security policy.

Those of you who remember the old Foreign Broadcast Information Service, the organization upon which the Open Source Center was founded, know that that organization possessed certain capabilities in accessing, analyzing and managing open source information in its own right. It also operated as a service of common concern, which means its products and services extended well beyond its host agency's chain of command. While that capability and capacity continued to exist and grow, thanks to DNI support, we also realized that we have a much broader role as a community center. Effectively leveraging the world's unguarded knowledge, as one might consider open source, is a daunting task and realistically, probably too much to expect of any one organization, at least as traditionally envisioned. So even when viewing this effort through a national security prism, there's a lot of stuff, in other words.

Considering, also, that as Ms. Townsend noted, our business lies at the confluence of arguably the world's two most dynamic industries, media and information technology, I believe the wisdom of building an enterprise where the whole is truly greater than the sum of its parts is apparent. In the long term, I consider approximately 50 percent of the Open Source Center's value proposition will be the result of what the center itself collects and produces. The other 50 percent of our report card, as it were, will be determined by how we facilitate the use and impact of open sources elsewhere in government. If we do this right, I am convinced we will not only realize unprecedented intelligence value through open sources, and in fact, I believe we're already seeing this, but we will save the government money by allowing our more expensive cousins in the intelligence community to focus on that which is truly secret.

Now, how do we, as a DNI center, facilitate the use and impact of open source government-wide? I thought of four ways. First, by exporting our expertise within OSC. One of the points General Hayden made as PDDNI, when he helped stand up the center, was that he saw in OSC unique expertise that he wanted us to export to other government entities. Now, we were looking to do this in a number of ways. First, through training. Now, what we've learned in open source over the years is that open source exploitation is more than just advanced Googling. There are methodologies involved, there is tradecraft, there are whatever words you want to use that make open source exploitation not always intuitive. So what we're taking – what we've learned over the years, putting it in a curriculum of, right now it's about a dozen courses, available to the entire intelligence community and trying to export our expertise through that way and as a way to get our expertise out.

Second, we have piloted last month an Open Source Fundamentals, or other people call it Open Source 101, which is the basics of open source exploitation to get those who are either beginning, or in a lot of cases, experienced open source practitioners some insider updates into what's going on in open source today. Second, we're looking at providing what we call embedded support. One of the best ways that we can get our expertise out to other organizations

is to put one of our officers there. All of a sudden, when an officer is on site, it benefits the enterprise two ways. One, it gives that particular organization not only the benefit of that officer's expertise but a tether back to OSC that that organization otherwise wouldn't have. On the other hand, it makes our officer much more aware of what certain customer sets are interested in and in the end makes them, and when they reach back to the center, the center much more effective in supporting that organization.

Third, we've learned a lot, as I've said, in terms of methodologies and policies. There are certain things you can and cannot do when you're exploiting open sources. There are certain laws you have to be aware of and taking the benefit of our experience over time, we can work through the ADDNI for Open Source to export those policies and methodologies.

Second, in terms of our value as the DNI Open Source Center, it's creating economies of scale. Because the opportunity cost for getting into the open source business is relatively low, one value of the Center is to make it easier for people to navigate the multitude of available information and over time reduce or avoid duplication. So our areas of focus in this category include data acquisition. Why pay for something six different times or more if you can effectively negotiate one contract and make it available to the entire community or government? Training, again, if we have one bona fide approach to training open source exploitation methodology, one that takes the best of all practices, not just OSC, but to provide one training approach, that will create economies of scale that will benefit the enterprise in the long term.

Third, content management and broadening information sharing. We have two types of customers. We have one that tell us, Doug, don't tell me what I need to know, just give me everything and let me search it. Then the other customer is, Doug, I'm too busy to go through all this stuff, can you please tell me exactly what I need to know and only what I need to know and make sure I have access to that? So this concept of content management, we've discovered over the past five years, is crucial to the exploitation of open sources. It's not just enough to make it all available. It would have to be managed in such a way as to make it as effective and as precise as possible.

We, in OSC, when we looked out in terms of 10 years down the road, what our special sauce was going to be or our value proposition, we didn't see it in any one particular product, whether it's translation or analysis or whatever. We said our value is going to be that of trusted interlocutor. It's a term that, it is that people can come to OSC, and even if we don't have the answer in the center, we know where to get it. And to be able to do that is much more than just collecting and analyzing open sources.

Finally, under the economies of scale, it's being able to leverage developments and information technology, not just for the center but for the entire community. The third way we look at using our status as the DNI Open Source Center is brokering others' expertise. So we like to provide platforms for connecting likeminded efforts. A couple of weeks ago, we established a partnership with the Center for Intelligence Issues Research, which is under the U.S. Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, which makes available now to the community some significant and very well-done analysis on various aspects related to the Middle East. This

augmentations at very low cost, if any cost, the community's overall access to information about media in the Middle East.

We also look, using academics and think tanks, to extent we haven't done before in making their expertise available to the community. We have a blogger who provides us two to three days heads up on when the next Zawahiri or Osama bin Laden video is going to appear. We have experts from Boston University on China that blog for us and give our officers somebody to bounce ideas off of. As I said earlier, other U.S. government data and products that we can then make available to the – (unintelligible) – enterprise, whether it's strategic command, as Ms. Townsend noted, or INR, which is another, polling data is big hit for us.

And finally, foreign partnerships. There are foreign partnerships that we have. Some are well known, some are less well known, but again, whatever we work through those partnerships we can make available to larger enterprise. The fourth and, for now, at least, final way that we, as a DNI center, are looking to build that community enterprise is by making OSC itself more diverse in its composition as a community entity. I was just looking the other day that 12 of our 17 senior executives in OSC did not grow up in OSC, career-wise. That brings a diversity of thought and a diversity of perspective that we must continue to sustain if we're really going to become a community center. So our goal is actually to increase that number. One of our measures of success is how many people outside of OSC and our agency are actually working in the center.

So the fact that we are so focused on this community facilitation role leads me to believe that we can contribute directly to transforming intelligence, not just by what we do but how we do it. We in the Open Source Center, and you can talk to any one of my senior managers, will say the same thing. We're committed to the DNI's goal of community integration and believe that open source exploitation can be one of the first manifestations of a truly integrated community.

Why? First, we are an equal opportunity enabler. We do not perceive or manage ourselves as – (unintelligible). In fact, you won't hear me – (unintelligible) - not because I don't believe it but because it signifies or connotes stovepipe – (unintelligible). Rather, we see ourselves as significant proportions of other – (unintelligible) – where the challenge is to extract those unclassified portions to the most cost-effective means possible. In short, we want to carve out the unclassified intelligence, regardless of – (unintelligible). So if Zawahiri gives a speech, that's just an unclassified form of – (unintelligible). If we get signals about certain radios and broadcast data or things, IP addresses, about websites, it's a form of – (unintelligible). If it's commercial imagery, it's a form of – (unintelligible). If it's a map, it's a form of – (unintelligible). Taking that approach broadens information sharing and also allows other disciplines to focus resources on that which is truly secret.

Second, with regard to open source exploitation, we in OSC are finding we need to turn the linear paradigm of collection, analysis and dissemination on its head. Collection doesn't mean what it did 10 years ago. We don't have to go out often as much and collect stuff and turn it over to somebody else. Analysis, now, is integral to every step of the exploitation process, so with so much information available, we can't predetermine as much as we would do, say five or

even 10 years ago and say, we're only going to collect this stuff and then we'll figure out what we do with it based on what we collect. We ask ourselves, what are we actually – what questions are we trying to answer, and do we have the wherewithal and the access to actually contribute to that answer? So analysis, to us, has become integral to every step of the process for us.

Our ability to incorporate non-text elements in our products allows us to change the concept of product. It's not just text and it's not just paper. As I tell our folks, we can tell stories in ways we couldn't tell them two years ago, and that is, I think, still unique to open source. We have some advantages in terms of both information technology, in terms of our sources, that if you look at just something like YouTube, I saw some data the other day that said that YouTube will soon equal the BBC website as one of the most accessed websites on the Internet. That's because people like to watch stuff, and it's a good way to tell a story, using it in the right way.

We need to know who needs the information and what they want it for before we actually go collecting. So while many might still see open source primarily as a collection discipline, we have seen our value increasingly determined by what we do with the information at our disposal as much or more than by what we collect and give to others to figure out. The open source discipline, I think, is unique in that it is a full-service discipline, or we call it end-to-end, from collection to dissemination.

Third, as I mentioned earlier, we believe our value lies as much in enabling others as in what we produce ourselves. We take our community center role seriously and take great pride in highlighting or helping other ICR (?) government agencies develop their own open source capabilities. In a briefing a weeks ago, a senior policy maker, he said, you know, what I like what you guys have been doing recently is you've been including much more polling data on your website, and I was happy to point out that the polling data was actually from INR. It wasn't OSC. But it was because we were able to highlight that and we saw that as integral to the story we were trying to tell and certainly have a customer base for it, it helped that organization have an impact or reach it might not otherwise have had.

Papers that we get from the National Intelligence Council, what we call NIC associates papers, unclassified but insight on areas where otherwise we might not have it as a community. So within this model, we get as much satisfaction out of seeing DIA or NGA develop its own open source capabilities and in fact, those two agencies are doing so, as in developing our capabilities within OSC. As these capabilities develop, we in OSC can then turn our attention to leveraging other components' unique expertise, data and/or comparative advantage on behalf of the entire U.S. government, and in the process, we provide OSC officers with information and expertise to which they otherwise would not have access.

Fourth, again, in terms of how we think we can help transform intelligence, we treat technology as integral to the open source mission. The success of each of our IT projects is the responsibility of a senior mission officer, not just IT. For us, IT is no more a support function than the circulatory system and heart support the human body. Given the volume and variety of our universe, effective application of information technology to us is essential to keeping pace with the opportunities this universe offers.

Fifth, and although we must respect the principles of copyright and contractual obligations, we do not have issues, to the best of my knowledge, with data ownership. In fact, as we build our network of partners and export our expertise, the agency or component that produces information will mean less than its quality and accessibility. This, to us, will determine the effectiveness of the enterprise we envision and in the end will justify the center's creation and the wisdom of the Robb-Silverman recommendations back in 2005.

Finally, as we've matured over the past 18 months as a center, we have been encouraged both by the acceptance of this model and the progress we've made in developing what we now call enterprise partners. These are other entities with whom we share both capabilities and expertise. I welcome the opportunities this conference offers to build relations with our existing partners and create new ones wherever the belief and interest in developing open source capabilities are manifest. So thank you very much for your attention, and I'm open to questions. (Applause.)

Q: Hi, I'm Lawrence Wright with the New Yorker. You say you have a blogger that tells you in advance that Zawahiri and bin Laden are going to have a video. I'd like to meet the guy and – (laughter) – know how you get in touch with this fellow. How does that come about? Is he your blogger or their blogger?

MR. NAQUIN: No, he's a private citizen. His name is Ben Venske. He runs IntelCenter, which is a private organization that looks at – (unintelligible) – websites, and he has sources or insight that somehow gets him advance notice to some of these. And he also does analysis on – does a lot of what I call the so-what, not just the video came up but what it means in context of it. This is just an example of being able to access outside expertise.

Q: Hello, I am Margot Williams of the New York Times, over here, and I'm interested in the component of your center that markets your products commercially. Is there going to be any innovation beyond marketing it through dialogue in its abbreviated version for the public?

MR. NAQUIN: There's two questions. Well, I guess it's commercial access to our product. This has been, for the past 15 years, we've worked with the Department of Commerce, NTIS, National Technical Information Service, and it's their charter responsibility to make whatever product they can of ours available to the public at a price. They sell it. In other words, they negotiate the copyright, so we cannot deal directly with the public because of copyright. So they handle that for us and then they give the royalties to the source and then they sell to the public and they arrange that deal. So we're not really involved in direct access to the public, per se, with our product. We work through the Department of Commerce there. So for us, it's really, our focus is on the government, the fair use piece of this, but Commerce helps us with the public side. In terms of innovations and can we deal directly with the public, this is something I've talked with Eliot about. Would love to do it, but right now, this is the way it works.

Q: Just a quick follow-up on what he was mentioned about NTIS, I'm a former NTIS employee, and just so people know, it is a non-funded agency within Commerce. It does not

receive a budget from Congress. It does through the sales of the database and through various products, as he was mentioning.

MR. NAQUIN: So I told the truth, right? (Laughter.) Okay. I've never got away with this few questions before, so it must be –

Q: Hi. In the back, straight back.

MR. NAQUIN: Oh, light's in my eyes. That's okay.

Q: I am Ben Venske from IntelCenter.

MR. NAQUIN: Oh! (Laughter.)

Q: That guy. (Applause.) For better or worse. The question I had is, as the user base continues to grow for opensource.gov and other outlets that you have, and you have providers like us and others that are providing proprietary content or copyrighted content, there's always that struggle with the licensing issues. As your user base continues to grow, other people want you to provide these other sources. There's obviously an increased cost that comes with that. Are you seeing the kind of funding appropriations that you need in order to be able to support, instead of having stovepipes throughout the community where everyone's buying individually, you're able to provide a broader audience and address the issues there?

MR. NAQUIN: The answer is yes to both, we have funding for a particular category of acquisition, and we work with it, whatever that level is. So then the real question, though, is the process that we need to put in place. We have one now, which is we negotiate, then, based on licensing. We pay the vendors a certain amount of money, and in return, we have to respect the license, which is within the intelligence community or if we pay for more use outside the intelligence community, et cetera.

But I think where we want to move in the future is a consortium model more along the lines of what many libraries do in the country, in terms of how they guarantee a certain yearly acquisition of data or services, if you will, and then look at a consortium model to go over and above that. But I would say, if I had to pick one of my top three or four things that I won't say keep me awake at night but that I think that we can use to our advantage as a community center, that would be one of them. We are doing it today, and I think we're doing okay, but I think we could do it more effectively and efficiently. It's a model, though, that even some of the vendors aren't used to because they work by organization. What we'd like to do is work more by things like seats or concurrent usages, and that's a model that we're all going to have to move to at the same time. Okay.

Q: Good afternoon. Paul Cezana (ph), gov.com Incorporated. As a private sector company that develops tools and product for a couple of components of the intelligence community, after this conference closes, is there a best point of contact to try to present some of our product and tools to a broader spectrum of the intelligence community?

MR. NAQUIN: Well, if you're talking about IT and in general in terms of the intelligence community, I would work through one of the CIO offices, either the DNI CIO or whatever agency you want to market your product to. From an open source standpoint, you can work through Eliot's office, or we have a technical, an IT organization within OSC that holds, I think, a semi-annual technology day where people come and they present their tools or their ideas for technical enhancements. It's the best answer I can give you at this point. It really depends what your focus in and what part of the market you're trying to get into.

Q: Neal Robinson, DeticaDFI. One of the things that I've heard over the years is that most intelligence agencies are evaluated on the basis of the relative contribution of their particular discipline to finished intelligence. I was wondering if you could talk about how you measure the relative contribution of open source information to those finished products, and is that a challenge?

MR. NAQUIN: It is, but it's not impossible, and as I tell our folks, there's no such thing as a perfect measure, but it's like a dashboard on a car. If your gas gauge is pointing to E, you know you're out of gas. You might not know why you're out of gas, but we spend a lot of time with metrics. We use measures such as we have access into what actually has been used, some of the analysis that we do at the policy maker level, at other levels. We look at accesses via our website, what's getting accessed a lot, which pages are popular, which are kind of not. We're constantly reevaluating based on kind of this quantitative data that we have. We use as a measure how much information we're making available to the entire community so the number of organizations that host information on our site or the number of folks that we can bring into our network of expertise as a measure of success.

So several different customer levels we need to be worried about, one, the policy maker side, but because, as Ms. Townsend said, our customer base goes literally from the White House to local law enforcement, we look at several different ways that we measure impact. We look at customer segments and we looked at macro levels. We have certain things that people expect us to meet in terms of benchmarks, the output of analysis, output of translations, so we keep track of those as well, and we create, quarterly, a dashboard that kind of gives us a picture of where we are based on what we said we were going to do.

Q: Hi, Sean Costigan, Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich. Just a question about how you choose international partners and if you can tell us a little bit more about who your international partners are.

MR. NAQUIN: Well – Chris, you don't mind if I mention you, do you? Our longest and probably most, our biggest, best, whatever adjective you want to use, international partner is the BBC monitoring service. They are so integrated that their products, they cover a third of the world, maybe a little bit more for us, and if something comes out of Moscow, it's done by BBC, but it will carry OSC brand. If it comes out of another part of the world, say Latin America, it'll go to BBC's customers with a BBC brand but it was done by OSC. So it's a truly integrated partnership. Now that's 65 years old, that partnership. It's older than I am.



We also have similar partnerships. About five years ago, we started one with Australia, has an open source branch. We have often bilateral relationships with other partners based on government sponsorship. So it really requires a government sponsor that would say, hey, these folks have some good information, we sponsor them, it would be good for us, and we pursue it on that basis. It's generally in terms of – I won't call it a tradeoff, but we're looking for mutual benefit. Okay. Well, again, thank you very much for your attention this late in the day – (applause) – and I look forward to working with you.

MR. JARDINES: Doug, thank you very much for your talk, and on behalf of the Director of National Intelligence, I'd like to present you with a small token of our appreciation for you coming out today.

MR. NAQUIN: Oh, well thank you very much. (Applause.)

MR. JARDINES: Thank you very much.

SABRA HORNE: Thank you all so much for attending today. Breakfast is starting tomorrow at seven o'clock. We know you military folks like to get a good, early start, and the sessions begin at eight, so we'll see you tomorrow. Thank you.

(END)