

Other Government Reports

These resources may not be produced by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine and may not represent the views of the institution.

[The Cooperative Biological Engagement Program Research Strategic Plan: Addressing Biological Threat Reduction through Research](#), 6/2015, DTRA

“CTR has made critical contributions to global biological threat reduction, global biosecurity and biosafety, and advancing U.S. and partner nation health protection capabilities. The CBEP research program will continue this history of success through process improvement; integration with regional/country teams; and leveraging resources to improve return on investment. CBEP will use this strategy as a platform to guide, execute, and integrate improvements and changes to the overall program and its components using a systems approach.”

Albania Chemical Weapons Elimination Project (ACWEP), 10/14/2008, Brianne Tinsley of DTRA

Review the activities related to Defense Threat Reduction Agency’s Albania Chemical Weapons Elimination Project

[Defense Imperatives for the New Administration](#), 08/2008, Defense Science Board

“This report describes those issues that the next Secretary of Defense should place at the top of the agenda- issues that will require the attention of the Commander-in-Chief, and if left unresolved, could lead to future military failure.”

[Future Directions for DTRA Missions and Capabilities to Counter WMD](#) (Carter-Joseph Report), 3/20/2007, DOD

This is a FOIA exempt final report by the Carter-Joseph panel covering all DTRA mission areas for WMD, including the CTR program. “While CTR work in the former Soviet states should remain a priority, the program should refocus and expand to eliminate/reduce, consolidate, secure, and detect WMD and related materials worldwide. CTR should establish a quick reaction capability...coordinated/rationalized with the DOD Joint Elimination Capabilities Element. The DOD International Counterproliferation Program could be merged into CTR. MANPADS efforts should not be. DOD should streamline the CTR obligation.”

[Global Challenge of WMD Terrorism](#), 8/5/2010, From the State Department Country Reports on Terrorism

“Since September 11, 2001, the international community has made significant strides in responding to the threat of WMD terrorism. States are working together bilaterally and multilaterally to address these threats and protect their populations. The United States has taken concrete measures to build a layered defense against the WMD terrorism threat. Through a variety of multinational initiatives such as the Global Partnership against the Spread of WMD, the Global Threat Reduction Initiative, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism, the United States has taken a leadership role in reducing the threat of WMD in the hands of non-state actors and terrorists.”

DTRA Future of CTR Study (Carter-Joseph Interim Report), 12/2007, DOD

This is a FOIA exempt interim report by the Carter-Joseph panel focusing only on the CTR program. “The most significant required change to CTR is to refocus and expand it to other regions to help address today’s WMD proliferation and terrorism threats. This will require not only an expansion of CTR’s geographic reach, but also innovation in how it operates and its assessment of proliferation threats.”

[DOD Global Emerging Infections Surveillance and Response System FY07 Report](#), 2007, DOD

“The expansion of the Department of Defense Global Emerging Infections Surveillance and Response System (DOD-GEIS) continued in FY07. Increased infectious disease surveillance sites, augmented containment laboratory facilities, and coordination of laboratory methods across the military health system characterize the DOD-GEIS activities that support force health protection, the combatant commands, and the global medical community. DOD-GEIS continues to identify and address critical gaps in emerging infectious disease preparedness and to develop, with partners, solutions to address those vulnerabilities.”

[Effective Multilateralism: The U.S. Strategy for Dealing with Global](#)

[Nuclear](#), 11/14/2005, Andrew K Semmel, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Nonproliferation, Address to the National Strategy Forum.

“I’d like to discuss three related aspects of the Administration’s approach to nuclear nonproliferation. I will first sketch out our overall strategy for meeting the threat posed by proliferation. Then, I’ll detail several of the President’s specific

proposals to strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime. And, finally, I will consider the status of efforts to keep nuclear material safe and secure worldwide.”

[Cooperative Threat Reduction: The Way Ahead](#), 9/28/2005, CTR Director John C. Byrd This brief slideshow gives an overview of how and where CTR should evolve beyond the FSU. It notes that Russia is wealthier and less cooperative, and that new partners could include the Balkans, Cuba, and Central and Southeast Asia.

[American Access to Russian Nuclear Weapons Storage Sites](#), 8/2003, Harold P. Smith Jr. (DTRA contractor)

Russian reluctance to give us access comes from “fear of intelligence collection, legal restrictions, lack of action on the Presidential Nuclear Initiatives, military doctrine calling for forward deployment, resentment that NATO retained its tactical nuclear weapons, distrust of US and NATO foreign policy, resentment of American economic policy, bureaucratic inertia, and not least, and national pride. CTR should assign top priority to quickly closing or enhancing the security of the most vulnerable nuclear weapon storage sites, consolidating other sites, and seeking access to the rest.”

[Administration Review Of Nonproliferation and Threat Reduction Assistance to the Russian Federation](#), Office of the President, 12/27/2001, Office of the Secretary of Defense

This fact sheet summarizes the results of the Bush administrations review of the various threat reduction and proliferation programs. It recommended the expansion of MCP&A, DOE’s Warhead and Fissile Material Transparency program, the International Science and Technology Center, and the redirection of bio scientists.

The Future of the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program: a Study for DTRA Advanced Systems and Concepts Office, 3/2001, DFI International (DTRA contractor)

“The study team found the CTR model could be applied effectively to DOD objectives beyond the current activities in the FSU. This expansion would be advisable vertically – to other activities within Russia such as sub dismantlement and biological weapons – as well as horizontally – to other countries such as North Korea, India, Pakistan, or former Yugoslavia. CTR could play a supporting role for the provisions of a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty or treaties mandating nuclear weapons free zones.”

[An Assessment of Preventive Threat Reduction](#), 2/8/2001, Science Applications International Corporation (DTRA Contractor)

Proven and workable preventive threat reduction include: treaties, executive agreements, confidence and security building measures, consultative mechanisms, arrangements such as the CTR and MPC&A programs, and parallel unilateral actions. Objectives for future U.S.-Russian threat reduction are strategic nuclear reductions, enhanced nuclear materials and weapons security, and nuclear warhead dismantlement and controls. These will benefit from use of a mix of preventive threat reduction approaches. Future U.S. strategy will require far greater internal U.S. coordination and less stove-piping.