INTELLIGENCE
AND SECURITY

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
5000 DEFENSE PENTAGON
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-5000

CLEARED
For Open Publication
10
Dec 13, 2022
Department of Defense
OFFICE OF PREPUBLICATION AND SECURITY REVIEW

December 6, 2022

MEMORANDUM FOR DIRECTOR, INFORMATION SECURITY OVERSIGHT OFFICE

SUBJECT: Fiscal Year 2022 Fundamental Classification Guidance Review

The Department of Defense (DoD) completed the attached Fiscal Year 2022 Fundamental Classification Guidance Review (FCGR). The report is a compilation and analysis of DoD classification guidance based on input from 44 DoD Components with original classification authority (OCA) and focuses on the comprehensive review of security classification guides (SCG). Of the 44 DoD Components with original classification authority, 11 do not have any applicable SCGs.

In response to the FCGR, DoD reduced the number of SCGs by 15 percent. As noted in the attached narrative, the Departments of the Air Force and Navy, as well as the National Security Agency, are developing new processes to overhaul existing SCG structures to improve how each evaluates and consolidates their SCGs. These efforts will result in additional reductions in SCGs, clearer classification and declassification guidance, and improved consistency in classification decisions in each organization.

DoD maintains the majority of its SCGs in UNCLASSIFIED and SECRET-level on-line repositories that are maintained by the Defense Technical Information Center. These repositories are searchable and help promote increased coordination between DoD Components on SCGs addressing similar or related topics.

The attached report will be supplemented by a classified annex. The point of contact for information security policy is Mr. Michael Russo, at michael.c.russo14.civ@mail.mil or (703) 692-7836.

Ronald S. Moultrie

Attachments:
As stated

FY 2022
Fundamental Classification Guidance Review (FCGR)

Section A: Identifying Information			
Agency:	Department of Defense	Date:	November 15, 2022
Name and Title/Position of Senior Agency Official:	HON Ronald S. Moultrie Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security		
Name, Title/Position, Phone Number, and E-Mail Address of FCGR Point of Contact:	Michael Russo Chief, Information Security Policy 703-692-7836 Michael.c.russo14.civ@mail.mil		

Section B: Consolidated Classification Guides (CCG)	
B-1. Does your agency have a CCG that consolidates classification guidance that applies for all components within the agency? If so, how many separate Security Classification Guides (SCGs) did your agency consolidate into the CCG? Please explain in your attached narrative.	Yes
B-2. Whether or not your agency has a CCG that applies for all components within the agency, does your agency have guides that consolidate classification guidance for specific activities, programs, or topics (including Special Access Programs [SAPs]) within the agency? Please explain in your attached narrative.	No
B-2a. If so, how many classification guides does your agency have that apply to the specific activities, programs, or topics (including Special Access Programs [SAPs])? When was (were) the consolidation(s) implemented? Please explain in your attached narrative.	N/A
B-3. In the absence of a current CCG that applies for all components within the agency, does your agency have a plan to develop one? In your attached narrative, please explain your agency's plan. If your agency has no plan for a CCG that applies for all components within the agency, please explain why not.	Yes

Section C: Security Classification Guides (SCG)	
C-1. Total number of classification guides at the beginning of the current FY 2022 FCGR. ***DO NOT COUNT DECLASSIFICATION GUIDES.***	2,139
C-2. Number of classification guides cancelled as a result of this FCGR review.	283
C-3. Number of classification guides consolidated or superseded as a result of the current FY 2022 FCGR. Please explain in your attached narrative.	92
C-4. As a result of the current FY 2022 FCGR, was there a determination that new classification guides are required? Please explain in your attached narrative.	Yes
C-4a. If there was a determination that new classification guides are required as a result of the FY 2022 FCGR, how many are required? Please explain in your attached narrative.	11
C-5. Total number of classification guides at the end of the current FY 2022 FCGR.	1,810

Section D: Security Classification Elements	
D-1. Total number of modifications made to increase the duration of classifications.	3
D-2. Total number of modifications made to decrease the duration of classifications.	1
D-3. Total number of exemptions from automatic declassification added to guides, pursuant to E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.3, (b)(1-9).	0

D-4. Total number of exemptions from automatic declassification removed from guides, pursuant to E.O. 13526, Sec. 3.3, (b)(1-9).	0

Section E: Shared or Multi-agency Guides	
E-1. Does your agency use any shared or multi-agency classification guides?	Yes
E-1a. If so, how has your agency conducted the review of such shared or multi-agency classification guides for purposes of the FY 2022 FCGR? Please describe in your attached narrative.	See narrative
E-1b. If not, is your agency considering the development of any shared or multi-agency classification guides? Please explain in your attached narrative.	N/A

Section F: Classification Guides in Electronic Format	
F-1. Does your agency maintain classification guides in electronic format?	Yes
F-1a. If so, are your agency's classification guides provided to users in a machine-readable electronic format? Please explain in your attached narrative.	No
F-1b. If all of your agency's classification guides are not maintained in a machine-readable electronic format, do you plan to put them in a machine-readable electronic format as part of the FCGR process? Please explain in your attached narrative.	No
F-1c. What is the total number of classification guides currently maintained by your agency in an electronic format at the end of the current FY 2022 FCGR, expressed as a raw number and as a percentage of the total number of classification guides? Please explain in your attached narrative.	1,591 (88%)
F-1d. What is the total number of classification guides currently maintained by your agency in a machine-readable electronic format at the end of the current FY 2022 FCGR, expressed as a raw number and as a percentage of the total number of electronic classification guides? Please explain in your attached narrative.	202 (13%)
F-2. Does your agency use an electronic marking tool to mark classified information in accordance with the appropriate classification guide? Please identify the electronic marking tool(s) used by your agency.	See narrative
F-2a. If so, what metadata standard does your electronic marking tool use to mark classified information in accordance with the appropriate classification guide? Please explain in your attached narrative.	IC ISM XML
F-2b. If your agency uses an electronic marking tool, does the electronic marking tool apply electronic markings in a machine-readable electronic format? Please explain in your attached narrative.	No

Section G: FGCR Review Process	
G-1. Was a working group formed to conduct the review?	Yes
G-2. If yes, did the working group include subject matter experts, classification and declassification experts, technical experts, and users of the guides? Please describe the process in your attached narrative.	Yes
G-3. If no, please describe the process used to conduct the review in your attached narrative.	N/A
G-4. During the review process, did your agency consider the following:	
G-4a. Should the information retain its current level of classification?	Yes
G-4b. Should any information be downgraded?	Yes
G-4c. Should any information be declassified?	Yes
G-4d. Is the current duration of classification appropriate?	Yes

G-4e. Are current exemptions from automatic declassification valid?	Yes
G-4e(1). If so, what is your process for confirming the exemption(s)? Please describe in your attached narrative.	See narrative.
G-4f. Does each guide contain the following information: (as required by 32 CFR 2001.15):	
G-4f(1). Identification of the subject matter.	Yes
G-4f(2). Approval and signature by the appropriate OCA by name or personal identifier, and position.	Yes
G-4f(3). Agency point of contact (and contact information) for questions regarding the guide.	Yes
G-4f(4). Date of issuance or last review.	Yes
G-4f(5). Precise statement of each element of information that requires protection.	Yes
G-4f(6). The level of classification for each element of information.	Yes
G-4f(7). If applicable, handling caveats.	Yes
G-4f(8). The concise reason for classification as described in E.O. 13256, Sec. 1.4.	Yes
G-4f(9). A specific date or event for declassification.	Yes
G-5. Have past and recent classification and declassification decisions been incorporated?	Yes
G-5a. If so, please describe the process in your attached narrative. If not, please describe why not.	See narrative
G-6. Has your FY 2022 FCGR process included cross-referencing information with other classification guides (internal and external) and coordinated the cross-referencing of classification guides with the appropriate OCAs to ensure consistency? Please explain in your attached narrative.	Yes
Section H: Training	
H-1. For the period under review, did agency personnel receive any training in the use of your SCGs, CCG, and all classification guides for specific activities, programs, or topics (including SAPs)? If so, describe the training in your attached narrative.	Yes
H-2. For the period under review, did agency personnel receive any training in the use of electronic classification marking tools? If so, describe the training in your attached narrative.	No
H-2. For the period under review, did agency personnel receive any training in the development of your SCGs, CCG, and all classification guides for specific activities, programs, or topics (including SAPs)? If so, please describe the training in your attached narrative.	Yes
H-3. For the period under review, were OCAs involved in the process of developing your CCG, SCGs, and all classification guides for specific activities, programs, or topics (including SAPs)? Please explain in your attached narrative.	Yes

Section I: Comments

See TAB B.

FY 2022 DoD FCGR Narrative

To support National Defense Strategy implementation and reduce unnecessary barriers to information-sharing with Allies & Partners, the USD(I&S) issued a memorandum on October 2, 2022 addressing the appropriate use of NOFORN on DoD information. The memorandum specifically addresses the actions original classification authorities (OCA) must take in regards to their security classification guides. The memo is attached for your information.

Section B: Consolidated Classification Guides (CCG).

- **B-1, B-3: Does your agency have a CCG that consolidates classification guidance that applies for all components within the agency? In the absence of a current CCG that applies for all components within the agency, does your agency have a plan to develop one?**

  The below DoD Components either have a CCG or have considered developing one.

  Chief Digital and Artificial Intelligence Officer (CDAO)/Joint Artificial Intelligence Center (JAIC): After building the JAIC SCG and reviewing the Project Maven SCG, it was determined that a Department-wide Artificial Intelligence (AI) SCG would not be feasible due to the pace of development and the scope of AI projects across the military services and other DoD Components. Security classification guidance related to AI is complex and must rapidly evolve as AI itself does. It shares aspects of programmatic, data, and operational classification guidance because the output, and even existence, of specific AI capabilities does not necessarily derive from or correspond to their data inputs or algorithms. Attempting to maintain such a document would result in a resource intensive, onerous process that would impede agile development and protection of AI equities. Instead, we recommended developing Department-wide AI Classification Principles to drive the overarching guidance of individual classification at the various program levels, where some AI developments would be simply appended to existing program and capability SCGs across the services and components.

  Department of the Navy (DON): This year, DON requested all OCAs identify the technology area their SCGs fell into in an effort to align current SCG information and nominate SCGs for future consolidation. They intend to start developing SCGs that cover technology areas instead of being program-specific, greatly enhancing their ability to evaluate horizontal protection while decreasing the overall number of SCGs.

  National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA): NGA published the Consolidated NGA (CoNGA) SCG on July 21, 2017, that merged all of its existing classification guidance into a single source. Since then, NGA has continually reviewed, updated, and maintained its classification guidance. The effort to consolidate, review, and remove any inconsistencies in classification guidance ensures the most accurate and appropriate guidance is provided to users, and allows users to quickly access the guidance to help ensure the most accurate derivative decisions.

NGA maintains the Security Management Resource Tool (SMaRT), which is best described as an online, searchable version of the CoNGA SCG. The tool allows users to quickly search classification guidance using key words or terms and to quickly make accurate derivative classification determinations. It also allows for the use of Boolean logic (AND, OR, NOT, etc.) in search parameters, and allows for the ability to perform advanced searches based on selected search criteria. The advanced search functionality of the SMaRT helps ensure the most accurate derivative classification determinations are made that help reduce over-classification and increase transparency.

The update and modification to the CoNGA SCG is managed through the Classification Management Working Group (CMWG) Rapid Change Process. The CMWG is comprised of representatives from all NGA OCA mission areas, and proposed changes and updates to the CoNGA SCG are effectively and efficiently managed through the CMWG for presentation to the appropriate OCA for their ultimate decision. The NGA workforce is encouraged and empowered to submit proposed updates/inquires to classification guidance regarding their respective mission areas through the automated CoNGA SCG Inquiry feature in SMaRT. The CMWG also ensures the current exemptions from automatic declassification in the CoNGA SCG are valid in accordance with the NGA approved exemptions from the lnteragency Security Classification Appeals Panel (ISCAP). Recent OCA decisions are captured in the updated versions of the CoNGA SCG that are published about every 6 months depending on the number of updates and modifications that are made by NGA's OCAs. As of the date of this report, the most recent version of the CoNGA SCG was published on December 15, 2021, which included a full review of the CoNGA SCG. NGA also publishes OCA decisions as soon as they are approved, allowing derivative classifiers access to the most recent classification guidance. This allows NGA to quickly and efficiently update and modify classification guidance in a matter of weeks or months, as opposed to years. This CMWG Rapid Change Process allows for quick updates to be made to the CoNGA SCG so that the most relevant, accurate, and timely classification guidance is provided to derivative classifiers to allow NGA to align classification guidance with its current mission and strategy.

Best practice: The addition of Enhancement Statements (Value, Damage, Unclassified) to each classified line item and Framing Components (Source, Method, Mission) to every line item in the CoNGA SCG can also be considered a best practice. These enhancement statements include information on the "Value" of why information is classified, the potential "Damage" that could occur if the information were not protected, and guidance on how information can be discussed at the UNCLASSIFIED level, if possible. The Framing Components assist users in identifying the type of information (Source, Method, or Mission) that is most likely to require protection in a given line item, and thus most likely to drive the classification level of a product. These three framing components are inherent to the value of all intelligence, including from where data comes (Source), how data is collected and turned into intelligence (Method), and why intelligence is created (Mission). The addition of enhancement statements for every classified line item, and framing components for every line item, allows users to make accurate derivative classification decisions at the lowest possible level by helping them understand why the information is classified and how to discuss it at the UNCLASSIFIED level, if possible. This allows for increased transparency and reduced occurrences of over classification.

National Security Agency (NSA): NSA determined an overhaul of existing classification guidance structure was needed to provide clear, comprehensive guidance, and launched the Classification Guidance Evolution Initiative (CGEI) in 2018 to evaluate, consolidate, and clarify classification guidance across NSA. The multi-year effort will culminate in the creation of four overarching SCGs that will contain all OCA decisions, consolidating 150 existing SCGs and 3,500 OCA decisions. The ultimate goal of the CGEI is to provide clear and easily implementable guidance, searchable in one repository.

The NSA Classification Guidance Team defined the overarching areas that all of the classification citations fit into and consolidated the guidance topics into those areas. They came up with four bins, called the Gold Guides: Intelligence & Cybersecurity; Mission, Research & Systems; Operational Locations & External Engagements; and Enterprise & Workforce Support.

During Round 1 of the consolidation phase, NSA identified the 14 SCGs containing the most fundamental information. The team took each citation from the SCGs and binned them into one of the four Gold Guides. They then consolidated duplicate information into single citations, de-conflicting classification guidance when necessary by engaging subject matter experts (SME) in the appropriate classification areas. NSA also engaged SMEs to finalize over/under classification issues with the citations by creating damage statements for all classified citations.

Round 1 of the new Gold Standard OCA decisions from the first 14 SCGs is published, and Round 2 consolidation has begun to cover the remaining, larger SCGs. Round 3 will finish the process of folding the remaining legacy SCGs into the new Gold Guides. Once the consolidation is complete, the team will set up an online searchable repository. The estimated completion date for the CGEI is CY 2024.

U.S. European Command (USEUCOM): During the course of this review, EUCOM discovered some information systems do not have classification guidance. To address this, they anticipate developing one future consolidated Bilateral Information Systems SCG.

Section C: Security Classification Guides (SCG)

- **C-3. Number of classification guides consolidated or superseded as a result of the current FY 2022 FCGR.**

The Components listed here provided explanations for their consolidation or supersession of SCGs.

Air Force – If a supplemental appendix/addendum was originally published on DTIC as a standalone SCG, those supplements were rolled-up into the parent guide. This includes guides that were issued for foreign military sales' purposes as standalone guides and uploaded to DTIC.

DIA – Several DIA components updated numerous SCGs which resulted in identifying superseding programs. Those SCGs were consolidated and re-staffed for renewal.

- **C-4, C-4a: If there was a determination that new SCGs are required as a result of this FCGR, how many are required?**

It was determined 11 new SCGs were required.

U.S. European Command (USEUCOM): A new consolidated Bilateral Information Systems SCG is under consideration.

U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM): Seven acquisition programs SCGs are currently in development; one operational SCG is under consideration for International Senior Seminars; two SCGs are set to be developed for new missions.

Section D: Security Classification Elements

Narrative response not required.

Section E: Shared or Multi-Agency Guides

- **E-1a: If your agency has any shared or multi-agency classification guides, how was a review of those guides conducted?**

The Components listed here have shared/multi-agency SCGs and provided information on their review process.

Department of the Army: The Army uses Joint Program Executive Office(s) and Joint Program Office(s) SCGs that cover specific programs that apply to the Army and other Services, and coordinates with applicable offices.

Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA): In cases where DTRA shares information with another entity such as DOE, DTRA utilizes not only DTRA's SCGs, but the DOE and Joint Security Classification Guides as well. DTRA ensures the classification levels in the DTRA SCG are compatible with all other shared SCGs to ensure proper handling of the information.

National Reconnaissance Office (NRO): NRO has one multi-agency SCG that supports collaboration efforts with our FVEY partners. This SCG was routed to all stakeholders for review and comment.

Section F: Classification Guides in Electronic Format

- **F-1a, F-1b: Are SCGs maintained in electronic format? Are the SCGs in a machine-readable electronic format? Do you plan to put them in a machine-readable electronic format as part of the FCGR process**

  The majority of DoD SCGs are maintained on the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) web pages on both the UNCLASSIFIED and SECRET-level systems. SCGs marked TOP SECRET, Special Access Program, or Alternative Compensatory Control Measures are not maintained at DTIC, but are maintained by the applicable DoD Component. While the documents are searchable, most of them are not machine-readable.

  Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA): DARPA SCGs are all scanned in electronic format utilizing an Optical Character Recognition (OCR) software that allows the entire guide to be searched. Additionally, each guide is uploaded into a web-based, DARPA developed, search engine tool called the DARPA Security Classification Resource Tool (DSCReT). DSCReT can be used to search across the entirety of the DARPA SCG portfolio, and is primarily utilized for horizontal protection, FOIA, and Mandatory Declassification Review (MDR) search queries and for general research purposes. An additional Archival database tool, Information Management System (IMS), is utilized for DoD policy and National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) record archive requirements.

- **F-2: Does your agency use an electronic marking tool to mark classified information in accordance with the appropriate classification guide?**

  DoD uses the Titus marking tool on SIPRNet and the Classification Marking Tool on JWICS; however, the tools are for marking emails and not documents.

Section G: FCGR Review Process

- **G-2, G-4e, G-5, G-6: Describe the process used to conduct the review of SCGs. Are current exemptions from automatic declassification valid? Have past and recent classification and declassification decisions been incorporated? Has your FY 2022 FCGR process included cross-referencing information with other classification guides (internal and external) and coordinated the cross-referencing of classification guides with the appropriate OCAs to ensure consistency?**

  The smaller DoD Components with a limited number of SCGs did not form working groups to review their SCGs, but conducted a thorough review nevertheless. Components with a significant number of SCGs used working groups to facilitate the review process. Notable processes are listed here.

CDAO/JAIC: Development of JAIC's first SCG began in the summer of 2019. Early in the process, the authors checked for any existing classification guidance regarding AI or machine learning (ML) to ensure uniformity and consistency across the enterprise. The authors searched the online database maintained by DTIC. While there are several technology-focused guides that offer good models to emulate, none thoroughly address AI/ML information, with the exception of USD(I&S)'s Algorithmic Warfare Cross-Functional Team(Project Maven). The authors consulted and coordinated with Project Maven early and throughout the development of the JAIC SCG. Early drafts of the JAIC SCG were coordinated internally and externally with Project Maven and information security experts who provided invaluable feedback.

DARPA: Although DARPA did not form working groups to review the SCGs during the FCGR process, each Program Security Officer (PSO), or their Program Security Representative delegate, identified an appropriate SME to review each document in its entirety. This SME evaluation, in conjunction with a thorough Security review, was performed on each guide, providing a comprehensive review process methodology.

Defense Contract Management Agency (DCMA): SMEs from the DCMA Industrial Analysis Division (IAD), made up of Defense Industrial Base (DIB) SMEs, Industrial Specialist technical experts, and security specialists, were all involved in the working group to update the Defense Industrial Base Task Asset List SCG in conjunction with the FY22 FGCR Review. During the FY22 FGCR Review and DCMA SCG revision the following were considered: 1) current information classification levels, 2) downgrades to a lower classification level, 3) declassification of information, and 4) appropriate classification duration. There are no exemptions from automatic declassification pertaining to the DCMA SCG. The DCMA SCG contains all required information set forth in 32 CFR 2001.15. The working group incorporated previous classification and declassification decisions into the SCG. Reviews of derivative classification decision guidance were conducted, and the most recent controlled unclassified information (CUI) implementation guidance was also applied. The DCMA IAD working group coordinated with SMEs from the OUSD (Policy) Defense Critical Infrastructure (DCI) Line of Effort (LOE) SCG. The coordination resulted in cross-referencing the DCMA SCG with the DCI LOE SCG classification elements, and then applying revisions where needed. The DCMA SCG and DCI LOE SCG reference each other where needed.

Department of the Air Force (DAF): Prior to this year's FCGR, the DAF performed a classification management study to get a better understanding of the total number of SCGs in circulation. That effort saw a change from 484 SCGs to 295. Prior to the issuance of a SCG, it is the OCA's responsibility to ensure that the information is not owned by another OCA. Therefore, internal and external cross-referencing is conducted in the preliminary phase. If discrepancies in classification/declassification guidance arise between OCAs, a classification challenge is initiated and a resolution reached. Upon resolution, each OCA is required to promulgate the new guidance to the enterprise.

Exemptions from automatic declassification are applied in accordance with the DAF declassification manual. This document is maintained by the Air Force Declassification Office (AFDO), and program offices must coordinate with them prior to using exemptions from declassification in their SCG. AFDO submits the DAF declassification manual to Information Security Oversight Office every five years, as required.

DON: The SAO conducted a kick-off meeting to establish requirements and expectations and held weekly meetings via MS Teams to answer questions from the OCAs. The majority of DON OCAs took the approach of establishing working groups consisting of engineers, users, security specialists, and program management specialists to conduct the FCGR.

Missile Defense Agency (MDA): A team of classification management security specialists reviewed agency SCGs to validate compliance with current security classification policy and other requirements. The team created a specialized SCG survey to support the review, and enabled the program offices to recommend retention or cancellation of the SCGs. Technical SMEs in the Agency Program Offices reviewed the SCGs to verify SCG applicability and topic relevance, and Program Managers validated the SME findings and approved retain/cancel recommendations.

NRO: A formal review was conducted by an assigned team consisting of a program security officer, program manager, and SMEs. All updates were documented and a coordination package prepared for final OCA review.

U.S. Africa Command (USAFRICOM): Each Directorate identified SMEs who reviewed information and provided feedback and additional guidance. The Information Security office provided suggested changes, met with several SMEs, and incorporated the changes. The Original Classification Authorities reviewed changes and made additional recommendations.

USEUCOM: USEUCOM approached this task in phases that correspond to FCGR progress updates and final report deadlines. Phase 1 was both a planning and preparation phase which included creation of a USEUCOM FCGR Concept of Operations, internal research to identify all SCGs under USEUCOM OCA purview, cataloguing of the SCGs, documenting historical training for the period under review, and identifying knowledge gaps. Phase 2 involved creation of a small working group where USEUCOM solicited input from stakeholders and subject matter experts, technical experts, and classification guide users – including plan developers who struggle with building out the U.S.-only and releasable versions of SCGs. Phase 3 included the creation and completion of one specialty SCG (Russia-Ukraine), identification of an SCG already superseded, and the need to consolidate many others. USEUCOM is currently reviewing two additional SCGs for updates and/or consolidation, with others pending further review. Current staff numbers and competing operational priorities dictate this will be an ongoing process.

Section H: Training

- **H-1, H-2, H-3: Did personnel receive any training in the use of SCGs? For the period under review, did agency personnel receive any training in the development of your SCGs, CCG, and all classification guides for specific activities, programs, or topics (including SAPs)? For the period under review, were OCAs involved in the process of developing your CCG, SCGs, and all classification guides for specific activities, programs, or topics?**

  The Center for Development of Security Excellence (CDSE) has developed many security training courses that cover all aspects of information security to include SCGs and OCA responsibilities. Additionally, SCGs are covered in other courses such as the Derivative Classification course.

  CDAO/JAIC: The subject matter experts (SME) in the JAIC completed the OCA training provided by CDSE prior to developing their security classification guide (SCG) and provided a tailored briefing and desk-side reference to the Director, JAIC, clearly outlining security classification and declassification guidance and the responsibilities of an OCA.

  National Reconnaissance Office (NRO): The NRO has several training courses that address the use of SCGs, to include Classification Management for Derivative Classifiers (Mandatory Training); Classification and Markings-Classification 101; Classification Management 100 (Web Based Training); OS&CI 150 Security Course; Classification Management 200; and Directorate/Office specific training sessions. The use of SCGs is addressed in each of the above courses. Classification 101 has a section on addressing how to create a SCG. CM 200 provides NRO personnel requiring classification training above and beyond what is provided in web-based training (WBT) courses. This instructor-led course, to include SME guest speakers, is designed to provide Classification Management Officers, Program Security Officers and other interested NRO personnel with an in-depth comprehension of classification theory and the ability to apply that knowledge in their day-to-day duties. Topics covered in the two-day course include Classification Management Tools, Controlled Access Programs, Foreign Disclosure, FOUO/CUI, Declassification and Public Release, Classification Guidance, ISOO/ISCAP, and the NRO Self Inspection Program.