



181 NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.



OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR

November 5, 1969 (AR-A-8

Dear Dick:

Thank you for your comments on the NASA earth-sensing activity guidelines memorandum. Since you say that you have no substantive problems with the paper, I propose to distribute it to the addressees.

You raise two valid points and I would like to comment on them.

- a. You point out that perhaps the NSAM 156 Committee should review my proposal. I believe that my proposal for revised guidelines is in accord with the recommendation of that Committee and I do not feel that a meeting is necessary now. A Committee meeting will probably be required when NASA proposes actual development of systems yielding better than 20 meters ground resolution and they may do so shortly after their review of the MOL-developed tracking telescope. For the time being, NASA can study such possible systems for performance to 5 meters within guidelines. Our concern in this area relates primarily to NASA's earth resources program and a possible political confrontation if the program becomes provocative. The security policy guidelines provided by you and the NSAM 156 Committee seem adequate at present and I will operate accordingly.
- b. You also express concern about NASA releasing data on orbital astronomical instruments which may reveal the quality of our reconnaissance systems. Although I propose to recognize NASA astronomical experiments as non-provocative to other nations,

DOD DIRECTIVE \$200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

BYE 13350-69



I realize that we must also insure protection of critical technology. The SACC will have the continuing responsibility to review NASA orbital astronomy projects and identify those aspects which cause this type of concern. The SACC will develop security protection recommendations after a NASA experiment has been defined and before hardware procurement is authorized. The first case in point may be a NASA proposal to use some optical technology derived from the DORIAN telescope of MOL. I will monitor closely their study of this idea and keep you and the other members of the ExCom informed of developments.

Sincerely,

John L. McLucas

BYEMAN CONTROL SYSTEM

TOP SECRET

EXCEUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
DOG DIRECTIVE 320D.10 DDES NOT APPLY

CONTROL NO	BYE	13350-6	6
COPY	OF	COPIES	
PAGE 2	or	2 PAGES	

TUP SEUKE

15 NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE

WASHINGTON, D.C.



THE NRO STAFF

October 15, 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR DR. McLUCAS

SUBJECT: Guidelines for NASA Earth-Sensing Activity

Mr. Helms has responded to our note which asked his review and comments on the guidelines paper you are preparing to send to the ExCom. Although he sees no major difficulty with the contents, he has raised two points for your consideration.

1. He suggests it might be appropriate to refer our proposal to the NSAM 156 Committee for final action.

Comment. We agree with Mr. Helms that this subject is of interest to agencies other than DOD and NASA. On the other hand, we do not feel that our proposal need be acted upon by the NSAM 156 Committee. In its earlier review of NASA activity in this area, the Committee concluded that NASA should develop with the concurrence of the NRO a detailed set of rules to facilitate the application of the approved general guidelines. This set of rules was developed by the NRO and NASA, and has served as the basis for the continuing review by SACC of all NASA activity in this area. Our current proposal is essentially an updating of those rules. It is consistent with the established guidelines and with the Committee's guidance and recommendations, as agreed to by the several agencies involved.

This is not to amply that the effort NASA is currently planning will not need to be reviewed at some particular point by the Committee. Should NASA decide that it needs to proceed with the actual development of a system which would deliver products exceeding in quality of ground



EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING DOD DIRECTIVE: 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY



resolution the currently approved 20 meters, we would need a policy consideration by the Committee for any relaxation of the restrictions.

2. He suggests that the removal of any limitation on NASA's use of optical systems for astronomical purposes would still leave open the question of making available, in unclassified form, detailed design data on optical systems.

Comment. As noted in our proposal, we have for some time recognized astronomical experiments as intrinsically non-provocative to other nations, and consequently have considered the restrictions imposed on these experiments to be somewhat unrealistic. Our proposal would merely except such experiments from a SACC review as non-earth-looking efforts. It does not remove the existing requirement for a review of these efforts by SACC to insure that there is no adverse impact on the NRP. Specifically, it is intended that the SACC would continue to review NASA space flight astronomy projects, prior to initiation and after a definition of the hardware to be procured or used, for possible relation to NRP or military hardware and techniques. It is also a function of the SACC to develop security protection recommendations for potentially sensitive instrumentation and data which may be used in astronomical systems. We feel that these reviews would insure the protection of potentially sensitive optical system design data and instrumentation.

In summary, our proposal is consistent with the NSAM 156 Committee guidance and recommendations. We do not consider it necessary that the revised rules for implementing the Committee's guidance be referred to the Committee for final action.

The procedures for implementing these guidelines recognize the potential sensitivity of detailed optical system design data and its adaptation for reconnaissance purposes; and provide the means for insuring its protection within the appropriate security system.

I have attached, for your signature, a response to Mr. Helms' memorandum. Since Mr. Helms does not feel strongly about the necessity of referring the proposal to the NSAM 156 Committee,



TOP SECRET

EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING
DOD DIRECTIVE \$200,10 DOES NOT APPLY

CONTROL NO	~~~~ <u>~~~</u>	
COPY	or	COPIES
PAGE	oF	PAGES

TOP SECRET



and since we have the means for insuring that potentially sensitive data is not made available in an unclassified form, I recommend proceeding, as planned, to obtain MSFPC approval of the revised guidelines for an early implementation by SACC.

WILLIAM R. YOST Colonel, USAF



EXCLUDED FROM AUTOMATIC REGRADING ODD DIRECTIVE 5200.10 DOES NOT APPLY

COPIES PAGES

RAR-B-16 RAR-A-8

TOP SECRET

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

MEMORANDUM:

October 7, 1969

NOTE FOR MR. HELMS

Attached is a paper which discusses the guidelines for NASA earth sensing activity.

Dr. McLucas is ready to distribute the attached paper to the members of the Executive Committee, but before doing so has asked for any comments you might have.

F. ROBERT NAKA

BANDLE VIA BY THE CONTROL SYSTEM

TOP SECRET