MEMORANDUM FOR: Dr. John L. McLucas

SUBJECT: Guidelines for NASA Earth-Sensing Activity

1. Bob Naka has sent me your paper dated 7 October 1969, subject as above.

2. This Agency has no substantive problems with the contents of the memorandum. We would, however, like to raise two points for your consideration:

   a) The actions already taken have been between DOD and NASA. Since the NSAM 156 committee was charged with reviewing this matter on a government-wide basis, it would seem appropriate for this proposal to be referred to that committee for final action. We do not feel strongly about the necessity for this, but it is clearly a subject of interest to more than these two organizations.

   b) The memorandum says that there would be no further limitation on the type of optical systems used by NASA as long as they were pointed upward for astronomical purposes and not used to photograph the earth. That still leaves open the question of making available in unclassified form detailed design data on optical systems which could be readily adapted for reconnaissance purposes.

Richard Helms
Director
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 imply 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
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,
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
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