DTAG PLENARY MINUTES
November 9, 2011

Directorate of Defense Trade Controls (DDTC) Managing Director and Designated Federal Officer Robert S. Kovac made opening comments to the November 9, 2011 Defense Trade Advisory Group (DTAG) public Plenary session at 1:00 p.m. in the East Auditorium at the Department of State.

Mr. Kovac thanked DTAG Chairman Sam Sevier and the DTAG members for their work and said that he looked forward to hearing the presentations by the DTAG Working Groups. He thanked each DTAG member for their contributions, especially as their two year terms were about to expire. Mr. Kovac said that the State Department would not have been as well informed if not for the DTAG's efforts and that he wanted members to be recognized. DTAG recommendations would be reflected in new Federal Register notices. Mr. Kovac urged the members to continue to comment on proposed reforms.

Mr. Kovac provided an update on the Administration's Export Control Reform initiative: The USML Category VIII update was on the street for comment and re-writes of additional categories would follow fast and furiously. State Department officials had briefed the Congress again this week. Category XIX on Gas Turbine Engines would be published in the Federal Register by the end of November. Categories VI and XX had been sent to OMB and would be addressed in interagency review and published in the near future. The goal is to complete the re-write of the entire USML. Mr. Kovac urged DTAG members to carefully review the proposed rules as they had to be clear and understandable and was looking forward to their comments.

Mr. Kovac said that Assistant Secretary Shapiro had been called to the White House and to the Pentagon, but wanted to address the DTAG, so the schedule would be adjusted as necessary to enable Secretary Shapiro to speak as soon as he arrived.

Mr. Kovac then formally convened the DTAG Plenary session and invited Chairman Sam Sevier to continue the meeting.

Mr. Sevier welcomed participants and recognized participation by Department of Commerce Assistant Secretary Kevin Wolf.

Mr. Sevier explained that the DTAG had been given three tasks: 1) Review and comment on the Department of Commerce Bureau of Industry and Security July 15, 2011 Federal Register Notice: "Proposed Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations (EAR): Control of Items the President Determines No Longer Warrant Control Under the United States Munitions List (USML), 2) Review the ITAR definition of "public domain" and the EAR definition of "publically available" and determine if it is possible to develop a single term and definition, and 3) review and comment on a "single form" to replace the existing State, Treasury and Commerce License Applications. We formed three Working Groups that included members from both inside and outside the Washington Beltway to address these tasks. The Working Groups were asked to look at their projects from a defense industry business development and production viewpoint, including the perspective from smaller defense companies. The intent was to try and obtain views from across the broad defense industry sector.

The three Working Groups were formed two lead members (the aim was to have one from "inside the beltway" and one from outside with the aim of diversifying the experience and focus as much as we could; we didn't quite reach that goal as can be seen by the location of the leads, but the team compositions made up for that).

Working Group one, co-chaired by Kim Depew/General Electric, Cincinnati, OH and Krista Larsen/FLIR, Wilsonville, OR was asked to propose a construct to transfer items that no longer warrant control on the USML to the CCL, consistent with regime commitments, foreign policy, and national security frameworks. The broad areas of this proposal were to add the "600 series" ECCNs; to create ECCN OY521; to change or to add EAR definitions to enable transfer of items; and to update other areas of the EAR to support the transfer of items.

Working Group Two, co-chaired by D. Michael Cormaney/Luks Cormaney, LLP, Washington, DC and Gregg Hill/DRS Technologies, Arlington (Crystal City), VA was charged to develop a definition of "information in the public domain" that: precludes multiple or overlapping controls; adds clarity; limits misinterpretation or misuse, and; supports enforcement and

prosecution. The ultimate objective was to create a single definition of public domain information for both the ITAR and the EAR.

Working Group Three, co-chaired by Lisa Bencivenga/Lisa Bencivenga LLC, Centerville, VA and Joy Speicher/Loral, Inc., Palo Alto, CA was asked to review and provide comments on a "Draft Single License Form Proposal as of 8/31/2011", which is intended to replace existing State, Treasury, and Commerce Department license applications, and to recommend any changes required for consideration by the interagency government players.

Mr. Sevier said that all of the tasking papers, the reports and the slide presentations along with the minutes of the Plenary would be available on the DDTC website not later than end of December 2011.

Mr. Sevier invited Mr. Bill Wade/Raytheon Company, the DTAG "Straw Boss", to moderate the Working Group presentations. Mr. Wade echoed the comments by Mr. Kovac and Mr. Sevier thanking and complementing the DTAG members and Working Group co-chairs on their contributions. Mr. Wade described the Working Groups' tasks as being extremely complex and difficult to cut down to operational recommendations. Mr. Wade asked that the DTAG members and public attendees hold their questions until the Working Group presentations were completed.

Ms. Kim Depew and Ms. Krista Larsen, Presentation by Working Group One on Transfer of Items from the USML to the CCL
(Link to Working Group Presentation)

Ms. Depew presented the Working Group team members, thanked the team for putting in so much time for this assignment, and commented on the difficulty of condensing a Federal Register notice of more than 130 pages (the Word version) into a single presentation slide. She highlighted that the team was asked to answer six questions about the proposal from an industry perspective (does it provide adequate national security and foreign policy protection; meet national and economic security objectives, allowing more interoperability with NATO and other regime partners and reducing the incentives of foreign companies to avoid or design out U.S. origin content; propose a good definition for "specially designed"; create an overlap or gap with the draft of 0A606; require less onerous record keeping requirements; and create any other issues the government should take into account in preparing the final version of the regulations). Ms. DePew then summarized

the answers for the first three questions. The summary can be found at the link below.

Ms. Larsen joked about whether Oregon or Ohio constituted the "hinterland" referred to by Mr. Sevier when he noted the geographic diversity of the current DTAG membership. After summarizing the answers for the final three questions, she added that the Working Group's white paper would be included on the DDTC web site together with the group's formal presentation on transfer issues.

Ms. Depew and Ms. Larsen presented the Working Group's 43-page report, which is available on the DDTC web site at http://www.pmddtc.state.gov/.

Following the presentation there was a Question and Answer session:

Q: Mr. Kovac commented on the de minimis component of the proposal and the working group's assertion that it would be difficult for foreign entities to calculate multiple de minimis levels—don't they have to do that now?

A: Ms. Larsen replied that entities will potentially calculate four levels of de minimis—those products containing 600 series (proposed de minimis content 10%) and those not (25%). Following that calculation, de minimis eligibility can be determined by destination (E1 countries = 10% and outside E1 = 25%), which is what they have to do now.

Q: A public attendee asked if the Working Group presentations would be made available on line.
A: Yes, the presentations would be available on the DDTC web site.

Q: A public attendee recommended that instead of the term "companies," that the regulation should address the bigger picture, to include universities and other parties.
A. Ms. Depew said it was a good comment and is should be considered.

A. Ms. Depew said it was a good comment and they would consider it.

DTAG Vice Chairman Joyce Remington/BAE called for a motion to submit Working Group One's report and recommendations to the DDTC. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a show of hands and voice vote by DTAG members.

Mr. Wade introduced Working Group Two's co-chairs, Mr. Cormaney and Mr. Hill, noting that in the request for volunteers in developing a definition of information in the public domain, the majority of volunteers were the attorneys and that the recommendations promised to be interesting.

Mr. Mike Cormaney and Mr. Greg Hill, Presentation by Working Group Two, Definition of Public Domain
(Link to Working Group Presentation)

Mr. Cormaney said the working group was a large one, with diverse experiences and opinions. The task was to develop a definition of "information in the public domain" that satisfies the following requirements put forward by DDTC: (i) precludes multiple or overlapping controls; (ii) adds clarity; (iii) limits misinterpretation or misuse and (iv) supports enforcement and prosecution. The ultimate objective was to create a single definition of public domain information for both the ITAR and the EAR so that exporters would not need to know two sets of regulations, practices, interpretations and related requirements.

In developing its recommendations, the group established sub-groups to conduct a detailed comparison of EAR and ITAR definitions and concepts; identify definitions from other laws and regulations; research constitutional limitations and application of prior restraint and first amendment cases; and build on previous DTAG work on definitions of fundamental research.

The tasking materials stressed that the definition of public domain should not capture information that was proprietary or otherwise subject to U.S. law; that it should include information lawfully made available and accessible to the public without restrictions on its further dissemination via proper channels; that it take into account availability of information on the internet; that it should clearly articulate the types of data that would be considered in the public domain; and that it should cite examples of the types of data that would not be considered public domain.

Mr. Hill said that DDTC provided the Working Group with a proposed definition of "information in the public domain" and examples of information that was not in the public domain. The Working Group had several concerns with the proposed definition, including the fact that the definition was in several places limited to information that was "lawfully"

released to the public. The Working Group generally agreed that this condition was not workable, as it would be difficult for third parties to know whether certain information – especially information on the internet – had been lawfully released.

The DTAG proposed definition, explanation and notes are contained in the Working Groups full 23-page briefing, which is available on the DDTC web site at http://www.pmddtc.state.gov/. The Working Group proposed a definition of "information in the public domain" that consists of two primary subsections. Subsection (a) defines information in the public domain as information that is generally accessible and available to the public – whether it was placed there lawfully or unlawfully. Subsection (b) then defines the methods by which information can lawfully be placed in the public domain (e.g., approval for public release by cognizant U.S. Government agency).

To enable the U.S. Government to control the use of information that was not lawfully placed in the public domain, the Working Group recommended a modification to the proposed new definition of "defense service" that was published by DDTC on April 13, 2011 to clarify that notwithstanding §120.11(a) (i.e.., the definition of public domain), furnishing assistance to foreign persons using information that a person knows or has reason to know has not been approved or authorized for public release by the cognizant U.S. Government department or agency constitutes a defense service.

Finally, the Working Group proposed a modified definition of fundamental research in a new section in Part 120 of the ITAR (rather than defining it within the definition of public domain.) .The new definition would clarify that fundamental research could occur anywhere (and is not limited to educational institutions) and that the inputs into fundamental research may require licensing prior to release to foreign students, even if the results of the research are considered "fundamental research."

The Working Group considered a significant difference between the ITAR and EAR with respect to publication of information. Under the ITAR, public release of technical data is an export subject to licensing. Under the EAR, public release of your own controlled technology is *not* an export and, thus, is not subject to licensing. These concepts must be reconciled if there is going to be a single definition. After much debate in the full DTAG, the recommendation was to keep USG cognizant agency approval as the sole path for obtaining approval for public release of technical data, but to

maintain the EAR publication principle for information subject to export controls (other than technical data).

Following the presentation there was a Question and Answer session:

A public attendee questioned whether – given the notice requirement in the proposed definition of defense service – the Working Group had considered recommending that U.S. exporters be required to mark all information that constitutes technical data. At present there is no requirement to mark technical data, but there was pressure on the defense community to do so. He also commented that there was a clear distinction on information obtained on the internet based on whether it was obtained from public sites or potentially improperly from U.S. government sites. DTAG Chairman Sevier added that on the question of marking documents, there is not a clear definition of "technical data" and that it is in the eye of the beholder. Asking a contractor to self-define what technical data was is probably not what the DDTC had in mind.

A public attendee commented that it was sometimes difficult to determine who was the "cognizant U.S. government authority" involved in releasing data to the public domain because there was no definition of "cognizant authority" in the ITAR. Mr. Hill noted that this process is well defined within the Department of Defense and the MILDEP process. He suggested that this might be something to add in a note to the new section, but observed that the cognizant agency may change, and Federal Regulations do not always keep up with departmental changes.

A public attendee asked if the Working Group had considered the element of time in connection with the definition of "public domain." For example, information that existed on an internet site at one point might be taken down at a later time and no longer available at that site. The public attendee also raised the issue where information was intentionally placed on a web site for a short time and then taken off. Mr. Cormaney responded that in this circumstance, the placing of the technical data on the internet would constitute an export for which the poster could be prosecuted. Moreover, the person receiving such information likely would have knowledge that the information was not properly released given the circumstances and, thus, would be restricted from using such information in providing a defense service without a license.

DTAG member William Schneider complimented the Working Group for its good work on a difficult problem. He said that DoD was also struggling with this issue and that there could be insurmountable issues to manage. The State Department's efforts had to be harmonized with those of the Defense Department, noting that there is a tremendous burden of compliance on DoD working with the issue of what is public domain information. Mr. Schneider asked if the Working Group had consulted with the Defense Department in its deliberations. Mr. Sevier noted that the DTAG members were required to keep their deliberations private until they were presented in a Plenary forum.

A public attendee indicated the importance of a single definition of fundamental research. He commented that the policies were confusing. It was critical to unify the EAR and ITAR definitions, for example, because the university collaborated closely with industry on industrial design and other research. Much of the research was conducted with Stanford as a subcontractor. Some of the material developed was under DoD or DARPA sponsorship, which involved intellectual property (IP) and licensing. The IP issue was a huge mess. Was this material in the public domain? Did that mean that the information could not be published? Would they be required to take foreign nationals off the research project?

Mr. Hill replied that if the material was published then it was in the public domain. If the research provisions specified that the material was restricted from publication, then it was not in the public domain. Such restrictions would not necessarily mean the research was subject to the jurisdiction of the ITAR though. Referring to the 2008 and 2010 DoD letters signed by Undersecretary Young and Undersecretary Carter, Mr. Hill noted such research funded by the DoD was to be as free as possible from any restrictions and that if restrictions were required, the method available would be to classify the research, which would clearly make it subject to the jurisdiction of the ITAR. For non-DoD funded fundamental research there could be contractual restrictions placed on the effort. If for example Lockheed-Martin hired Stanford to do research on high altitude studies but did not want the results published, then the information would not be in the public domain because the researchers were told that the results would be proprietary. Again, this would not mean the research was subject to the jurisdiction of the ITAR, but only that it would not be considered public domain. The public attendee said that self restricting products of fundamental research impede research. Could there be a mechanism

established that would allow for pre-publication review of work products so that universities could public and make publicly available the results of fundamental research, taking into account the limitations placed by contracts.

DTAG Vice Chairman Remington called for a motion to submit Working Group Two's report and recommendations to the DDTC. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a show of hands and voice vote by DTAG members.

Mr. Sevier called for a break at 2:45 p.m.

Mr. Sevier reconvened the meeting at 3:00 p.m. and introduced Political Military Bureau Assistant Secretary Andrew Shapiro [Assistant Secretary Shapiro's comments are attached].

Assistant Secretary Andrew Shapiro thanked DTAG Chairman Sevier and Vice Chair Remington, for all the hard work they he had put in leading the DTAG. He then recognized the other DTAG members for their efforts and the invaluable service that they had provided to him and to the Department of State. He thanked the representatives from several foreign partner nations that were in attendance such as the United Kingdom, Canada, the Netherlands and Sweden and welcomed them to the State Department.

Secretary Shapiro hoped that the DTAG Plenary was productive and looked forward to the reports from the three working groups. He said the DTAG insights were invaluable to the Export Control Reform effort and greatly aided the Department's work.
Assistant Secretary Shapiro then offered to take questions from the Plenary attendees.

A public attendee, referring to the anti-piracy and private security teams assigned to ships, asked if there was a disparity in the level of expertise in the companies performing those services? Would it be possible to use something like the Monroe Doctrine to apply similar controls for maritime purposes? Was there a code of conduct or standard of professionalism among these service companies?

A/S Shapiro responded that contact group discussions with partners are ongoing to ensure that the teams are professionals. Everyone wanted to

ensure professional conduct. U.S. shippers are responsible in their actions and are collaborating with the US Coast Guard on training. Having such teams on board had significantly reduced piracy actions.

DTAG member Ginger Carney asked why the decision had been reached to postpone development of the Tiered concept for defense articles and services. How much later would this be discussed?

A/S Shapiro said the based on the Federal Register notice on Tiering, feedback received expressed concerns about partial implementation and recommended doing it all at once versus piecemeal which would be very difficult burden for companies to implement. They would need to maintain two systems electronically and the cost and effort was an important element to consider. The focus now was on developing a bright line, then when the system was in place to address the Tiering process.

DTAG member Johana Hartwig requested comment on the status of moving items from the USML to CCL, and secondly on moving scientific and research satellites to the CCL. If this would require legislation, what was the status of such legislation.

A/S Shapiro said that Congress was waiting for a proposal from State so they could analyze it. That proposal was still in development at State and would be presented when complete. However, the State Department was still engaged on a regular basis with the Hill on these discussions.

DTAG member Andrea Dynes asked if Mr. Shapiro could comment on the ambitious 2012 plans for proposed Federal Register notices on moving USML items to the CCL. What could realistically be expected?

A/S Shapiro said consultation with the Hill was ongoing. State was developing final rules, the new system to include the electronic component and the transition plan. It was important to ensure that all the pieces were working together before implementation. A/S Shapiro thanked Commerce Assistant Secretary Kevin Wolf for his presence at the Plenary and acknowledged that Commerce was taking on more responsibility for this process. Categories on the CCL were open for comments, and the government was making changes based on comments received. Final rules are being put together. When they are in place, there will be a new export

control system. 2012 would be a year when a lot of final rules would be published and there would be a transition to the new system.

Mr. Sevier thanked Assistant Secretary Shapiro for attending the Plenary and leading the effort on Export Reform. A/S Shapiro departed shortly thereafter for meetings at the Pentagon.

Mr. Wade introduced Ms. Bencivenga and Ms. Speicher, Co-Chairs of Working on the "Single License Form". Mr. Wade said that in addition to the presentation about to be discussed, papers and background information not shown here would be available on the website Mr. Kovac commented that this was the "Turbo Trade" aspect of ECR and that a tremendous amount of work went into analyzing a single form. The DDTC team had coordinated closely with this team on the form analysis and critical data elements.

Ms. Lisa Bencivenga and Ms. Joy Speicher, Co-Chairs of the Single License Form
(Link to Working Group Presentation)

The computer system encountered some technical difficulties so initially the presentation could not be projected on the screen for viewing. Ms. Bencivenga commenced with the presentation rather than waiting for the malfunction to be repaired. She thanked her co-chair, Ms. Speicher, and the DTAG Working Group members for their tireless efforts on a complex tasking.

The format for the effort was based on a DDTC which tasked the Working Group to analyze and provide draft recommendations for a single license form to replace existing State, Treasury and Commerce license applications. During the effort, the Working Group sought clarification and dialog with DDTC because there were so many forms, regulations, and systems. The approach took the U.S. government's proposed form and compared it against current licenses and thereby created a License Matrix. The group then identified existing USG-prepared reports and created a Reporting Matrix. Using both matrices, tested the USG proposed Single License Form, DTAG Revised License Form and finally, provided recommendations back to DDTC. The recommendations, strategy and approach as outlined in this presentation, as well as the additional working documents and papers, have been provided to DDTC for publishing on the website.

Certain assumptions were made during the analysis and testing of the form, e.g., electronic decrementing will be addressed separately. Expectations are that the form will be and integrated into the existing system (D-Trade2, SNAP-R); however, they noted that Treasury does not presently have a form or information criteria. Rather, Treasury's process is an unformatted letter which identifies the significantly different data elements. This will require additional interagency coordination to meet the ultimate goal of the single form to be deployed in a single electronic system. USXPORTS (USX) is proposed as the USG interagency case management system.

The single form concept will use logic-based deployment enhancing the licensing process. For example, once an applicant enters their registration code, the form will auto populate information on the company. And templates could be created for recurring types of licenses. The data entry flow will be re-organized to flow logically. The DSP-85 and classified transactions still require work as the classified information cannot be used with the single form. Although security protocols will exist, the security will not be of the type that can protect classified information. The dialog between industry and government should continue.

The government interagency group developed the proposed Single License form and the DTAG developed the License Matrix, both of which are available at DDTC's website, http://www.pmddtc.state.gov/. The License Matrix was used to identify common and unique data elements, highlight fields on current forms that were not included in the USG Single License Form and flag unusual or uncommon requirements that were treated as the exception, not the rule. The DTAG analysis did not include review of foreign license forms for comparison purposes. Sections of the "USG Proposed Form" and the "DTAG Proposed Form" matrices were presented as well as two flow charts - one for the USG proposed form and one for the DTAG proposed form.

Ms. Bencivenga turned over the presentation to Ms. Speicher to discuss the recommendations on the benefits of a re-organized workflow.

Ms. Speicher said that a single form with re-organized workflow would benefit government and industry by increasing standardization, minimizing errors by reducing data entry, fewer "Returns Without Action" (RWA's) and reduce inapplicable data fields. Add logic based deployment to the single

form and additional benefits would accrue such as auto-fill of certain data fields with pre-determined and authenticated information, ability to enable or retain duplicate or template functionality for repeat and similar transactions, assist in automatic logic based review and staffing, link amendments and change directly to the affected authorization and generate reports. All of the benefits will drive compliance improvements and the USG and industry will have the same data. Currently, industry has internal systems or third party providers and the DTAG proposed system would lead to a common standard.

The Working Group recommendations to the Single License Form included amendments to the form, adding proviso/reconsideration capability and revise the section for dual/third country nationals because their role is different and requires different information. The group also suggested deleting manufacturer and source of commodity because parts manufactured years ago may not be identifiable or the manufacturer is no longer in business. The LO/CLO, CPI information and AT should be removed because companies store data on unclassified systems and sometimes the information related to these categories, when paired with other information, can result in classified information or at least sensitive information. At times, the LO/CLO information is classified yet the proposed export is unclassified. The details are listed in the License Matrix which had been turned over to DDTC as a tool.

Ms. Speicher elaborated on the amendment to a license whereby the applicant would choose a block, add the data and get a new license. Mr. Kovac said that the DTAG should look at amendments as a new license versus two separate documents. Ms. Speicher agreed and said that was the thought.

On dual/third country national revisions, Ms. Speicher said that the role for a foreign party requires different information than that of a foreign national. Mr. Kovac said that the Department of Commerce deemed export for foreign nationals was different than foreign nationals under the ITAR, but both were still exports. The company information was necessary, but employee home address may not be required as their role is a subset of the foreign party.

Regarding compliance, it was unclear on what disclosure on a "similar" item meant and suggested revised language. On proviso/condition reconsideration, by adding it to the Single License Form as a separate field it

can facilitate review and staffing, link it directly to the original authorization and allow reporting so that industry not charged by DDTC for this type of request and thereby lower their annual registration fees.

DSP-85 licenses cannot accommodate classified attachments. However, the DSP-85 could transition to the Single License Form because the risk of contamination is no different than current systems allowing upload of the DSP-85 from or agreement for classified programs in that the classified attachments are managed through a separate process. The Working Group suggested keeping a separate system as is done today. Mr. Kovac said they were still struggling with agreements as carrier of classified and was never intended to replace the DSP-85. USXPORTS will be the classified system. Can only identify that a classified export is desired to take place under license, but no data can be provided.

On deployment of the new single form system, the Working Group recommended that DDTC publish a deployment plan and schedule on its website. The Departments need to allow time for industry to develop internal interfaces with the new system (third party systems need to develop interfaces as well). They recommend that the Departments publish the interface specifications and allow the companies to develop or modify their front end interfaces to the USG system.

The USG prepared Report Matrix identified data elements needed to run the reports and it appears that much of the data is derived from current licenses and other USG systems such as AES. The Single License Form must be able to deliver reports needed by USG. Until the final form completed, the Working Group needs to validate where will required data come from and why some of that data is required. Mr. Kovac commented that some of the information is required by DOD to provide their reports and although not direct participants of the single form, they are a key interagency review office and their requirements must be considered as well.

One of the charts displayed by Ms. Speicher humorously suggested names for the new system, and she noted that other acronym suggestions were welcomed by the DTAG.

Ms. Speicher said the dialogue should continue and that the penultimate chart on the presentations had a series of recommendations, to which Mr. Kovac responded. With regard to coordinating the Commerce PECSEA,

Mr. Kovac said coordination and dialogue were ongoing. Mr. Kovac acknowledged that it has been difficult to get OFAC to participate as fully as needed on the single proposed license form, especially given that many OFAC requests are not currently done in a form but are done via letter correspondence. Ms. Speicher also acknowledged that the DTAG working group had difficulty getting OFAC to reply to members' calls for assistance on this project.

Mr. Kovac inquired if during the Working Group efforts they had benchmarked similar IT systems. Ms. Speicher said they found none and all agencies work with different tools that speak different IT and regulatory languages. Mr. Kovac said if they find similar systems performing similar type work with private industry, foreign governments, or other USG agencies, for example the NRC, to please identify those government agencies and forward that information to the DDTC.

Ms. Speicher said that brokering had not been addressed because it was dependent on the final rule.

Mr. Kovac said one of the group's recommendations was to delete the point of contact and information and asked why so. Ms. Speicher said that the contact information was not needed because few people faxed and people changed so often that the names could be outdated quickly. As for listing the website, what part of a Boeing or Lockheed website would be listed - the specific link to the product or person or the home page. Today, everyone uses Google to find those websites. Mr. Kovac said the purpose was to satisfy other involved government agencies such as DOD, and it was temporal in that the reviewer would want to use that information at the time of review, not in the future, so the information would be current.

Mr. Terry Otis, DTAG members, suggested the government expert or program manager point of contact should be included and Ms. Speicher confirmed that that data element had been retained. Ms. Speicher continued that point of contact information on freight forwarders should be reworded and re-thought.

Mr. Kovac said some contact information is required for other purposes such as Compliance requirements.

A public attendee said point of contact information and website information should be included. Ms. Speicher said point of contact information would remain but she was still not clear on what were the benefits of adding a website.

A public attendee asked if the Working Group had reviewed and compared the Department of Commerce Form 748P. Ms. Speicher said they had and had also reviewed SNAP-R and that information was worked into the matrices. However, not in great detail as the tasking had been to focus on State requirements.

DTAG Vice Chairman Joyce Remington called for a motion to submit Working Group's report and recommendations to the DDTC. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously by a show of hands and voice vote by DTAG members.

Ms. Remington thanked the DTAG and State Department as her participation had been most productive over the last two years. She thanks Mr. Sevier for his leadership role. She was being "exported" to Farnborough, England, with her company and said farewell and thanks to all.

Mr. Otis, the DTAG recorder, advised that any material anyone wanted to submit for the record should be emailed to him at OtisAssociates@verizon.net by COB November 16, 2011, and data or information could not be marked proprietary or otherwise restricted in its use.

Mr. Sevier concluded the meeting. Mr. Kovac formally adjourned the DTAG Plenary at 4:45 PM.

Submitted to the Honorable Andrew J. Shapiro, Assistant Secretary of State for Political Military Affairs

JAN 5 2012

Date

By:

Robert S. Kovac

Designated Federal Officer

George (Sam) Sevier

Chairman, 2010-2012 DTAG