

The Honorable Ellen Tauscher, former Under Secretary for Arms Control and International Security and Member of Congress from California, currently serving as a member of the Nuclear Threat Initiative Board of Directors

Testimony Before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee

March 17, 2016

THE FUTURE OF NUCLEAR NONPROLIFERATION

Chairman Corker, Senator Cardin, thank you so much for holding such an important hearing and thank you for all of your work to keep arms control and nuclear nonproliferation at the forefront of our foreign policy and advance U.S. national security. I realize we might not always agree on the approach and, there obviously are disagreements, but I appreciate the debate and discussion.

The global implications and potentially catastrophic consequences of the use of nuclear weapons against the United States and its allies is why the Obama Administration made nuclear nonproliferation one of the key U.S. policy objectives of its 2010 Nuclear Posture Review. The recognition of the dangers posed by a world of ever increasing nuclear proliferation is what motivated the President to announce his goal of moving toward a world free of nuclear weapons.

He tempered this idealistic goal—one shared by President Ronald Reagan—with the need to pursue it in a pragmatic and responsible way. He envisioned a way forward that saw the United States working with other countries to stop proliferation while also maintaining a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent for the United States and its allies so long as nuclear weapons exist. This balanced approach to the nuclear issue is essential to the national security of the United States.

That's why I care so deeply about this issue and have made it my life's work. That's why, when I was part of the Obama administration, we worked to create more certainty in an uncertain world. We sought to reduce the size of our nuclear arsenal, while making it safer, more secure, and more effective.

In 2010, the Senate approved the New START Treaty for ratification. This Treaty marked another step in our long-term effort to shift the United States and Russia from a world of mutually assured destruction to one of mutually assured stability.

While the United States and Russia made some progress in its relationship early in the administration's first term, Russia's provocative behavior in the Crimea, Ukraine, and elsewhere, coupled with its violations of existing arms control treaties, has made discussion of further reductions difficult.

It's unfortunate that Russia will not be attending the 2016 Nuclear Security Summit. Let me be frank: Russia's past participation was anemic. They didn't bring "house gifts," joint "gift baskets," and their negotiating posture has been to weaken the consensus texts. But Russia's absence does not necessarily signal anything about its commitment to securing its own nuclear material. Despite Russia's lack of action at the Summits, Russia has been a positive and active force in the Global Initiative, as if to prove that they will cooperate here and there.

I'm happy to offer more analysis of our relationship with Russia during the question-and-answer session.

The administration also restarted a discussion about ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, which, I can say this since I am not in public office, that if you opposed the treaty in 1999, there might have been good reason. Today, you would be right to support it. I hope the Senate Foreign Relations Committee can continue to look into how the success of stockpile stewardship and the global advancements in verification and monitoring have changed the game on CTBT.

In addition, we pushed for and achieved new forms of civil nuclear cooperation.

While the nuclear nonproliferation deal with Iran occurred after I left government, I believe it's the right agreement because it allows us to stop Iran's quest for nuclear weapons. We'll have to see how this plays out. Iran has commitments to meet and some of its recent behavior—the

missile tests—is disturbing. But Iran is constrained because of the deal and we have means of making sure those constraints remain in place.

A centerpiece of President Obama’s program to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons included hosting the first nuclear security summit in 2010 in Washington. This signaled a full-scale commitment to securing “loose nukes” and nuclear material. I’ll get to a few challenges facing the Nuclear Security Summit process, but in the short term bringing high level attention to this issue was and still is critical.

The summits themselves were more than a chance to talk and meet. The heads of government came to Washington, Korea, and the Netherlands with singular and joint commitments and action-plans in-hand to secure highly enriched uranium and plutonium.

What’s happened during the past six years and three Nuclear Security Summits?

- Countries have made vital upgrades to their regulatory frameworks, strengthened border controls, and ratified nuclear security agreements like the 2005 Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.
- Eleven countries completely eliminated their weapons-usable nuclear materials and many more have reduced the quantity of those materials.
- The number of countries holding nuclear material that could be seized by terrorists and used to build a bomb has been cut in half since 1991, from 52 to 24.

I am pleased that the administration is focused on strengthening the role of the IAEA, the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism (GICNT), the Global Partnership, and INTERPOL to carry forward the Summit’s strong focus on nuclear security. U.S. leadership is indispensable if the international community is to remain focused on the unfinished work of the Summit.

Unfortunately, this work is never done. Old threats disappear. New ones emerge. Technological progress that boosts economic growth and productivity potentially gives potential terrorists and smugglers new tools to steal fissile material.

As you know, I sit on the board of the Nuclear Threat Initiative, which was created 15 years ago by former Senator Sam Nunn and CNN founder Ted Turner to make sure that the world addressed the threat of nuclear weapons in smart and thoughtful ways.

Each year, NTI produces the Nuclear Security Index. The NTI Index has prompted countries to take a close look at their own security and has led to concrete improvements. On top of that, NTI's Global Dialogue on Nuclear Security Priorities has brought government officials, experts, and nuclear industry representatives together in a unique environment to develop creative yet tangible proposals that have been taken up in the Summit process.

This year's index has raised serious concerns—even as we approach the final Nuclear Security Summit—about how poorly some countries are doing to stop nuclear terrorism.

First, I recognize that it was always going to be difficult to replicate the success of the first Nuclear Security Summit. And progress has slowed since the 2014 summit. Between 2012 and 2014, seven countries eliminated weapons-grade materials. Since 2014, only one country—Uzbekistan—has done so.

In 2014, the Nuclear Security Index showed 19 improvements across five key security measures. This year's index showed none. What's dispiriting is that global stocks of weapons-usable nuclear materials are potentially on track to increase.

Second, too many countries are ill-prepared to protect nuclear facilities against cyber-attacks that could knockout critical systems that provide access control or cooling for spent fuel. The Nuclear Security Index found that 20 countries have NO requirements to protect nuclear facilities from cyber attacks.

Finally, the index found that countries with nuclear power plants and research reactors did not take enough security measures to prevent an inside-job. This was especially true in countries with ambitions to acquire more nuclear power.

Finding solutions to these problems will take enormous energy and creativity from future presidents.

A recent NTI white paper also noted some shortcomings of the Nuclear Security Summits. Commitments are voluntary and nonbinding. There's no accountability or external review to make sure countries are living up to their commitments. The communique resulting from the summits can often lead to a lowest common denominator outcome. But I want to be clear that having the summits is a much better outcome than not having them.

What's most disturbing is that most global stocks of weapons-usable nuclear materials are categorized as "military," making it outside the scope of the international security mechanisms that already are in place.

On top of that, countries must do more to protect their weapons-usable nuclear materials from theft and their nuclear facilities from acts of sabotage. They need to do a better job to protect hospitals and universities which have radiological sources with often little or no security. The Partnership for Nuclear Security, which my bureau managed when I was the undersecretary of State, does critical work to develop a culture of nuclear security and reduce the risk of insider threats at these facilities. Cyber-attacks present an altogether new threat. Any sort of breach of security would be disastrous.

In the meantime, Congress can do its part to make sure the United States leads by example. I realize that the budget battles of the past few years have put enormous pressure on all programs

But we have to do more than just keep the lights on. As it stands, the U.S. budget for nonproliferation efforts is inadequate. Last year, an Energy Department task force on NNSA nonproliferation programs noted that appropriations had declined by 25 percent between 2013 and 2016

even though the challenges we are facing requires that more money be spent.

I want to note a few shortcomings, which I think ought to be corrected:

In the current budget submission:

- NNSA is planning to secure 4,394 buildings with high-priority radioactive nuclear material by 2033 rather than achieve a previous goal of securing 8,500 sites by 2044.
- Funding for all Nonproliferation and Arms Control activities also would see a small decrease of \$5 million.
- Spending for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation Research and Development activities, which focus on developing technologies used in tracking foreign nuclear weapons programs, illicit diversion of nuclear materials, and nuclear detonations, would decrease about \$25 million in the fiscal year 2016 appropriation.

In the end, political and ideological battles should not be dictating funding for these programs.

I also want to appeal to this committee to continue its strong bipartisan support for the State Department's nonproliferation programs. State's work is critical in countering nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons threats.

On another note, I believe people are policy. Not having the right people in the right jobs isn't good for business or running a government. I appreciate that the Committee, in January, voted in favor of Laura Holgate's nomination to become our ambassador to the UN Missions in Vienna. I hope she can get a vote on the Senate floor soon. We need strong voices and competent people pressing for effective implementation of the Iran deal.

I appreciate the committee's invitation to testify and I'm honored to be a part of this panel. My hope is that the 2016 summit does not mark the end of an era, but ushers in a new phase of strengthened and lasting

international cooperation. And, I hope that future administrations and Congresses continue to focus high level attention on this issue.

Thank you and I'm happy to answer any questions as best as I can.