

SUMMARY: On Monday, October 4, 2004 (69 FR 59214) the Department of Defense announced closed meetings of the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on December 9–10, 2004, at the Institute for Defense Analyses, 4850 Park Center Drive, Alexandria, VA. These meetings will now be held at Strategic Analysis Inc., 3601 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 500, Arlington, VA.

Dated: November 29, 2004.

Jeannette Owings-Ballard,

*OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 04–28260 Filed 12–27–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of Advisory Committee meeting date change.

SUMMARY: On Thursday, July 8, 2004 (69 FR 41231), the Department of Defense announced closed meetings of the Defense Science Board (DSB) Task Force on Future Strategic Strike Forces. The meeting originally scheduled for December 15–16, 2004, has been moved to December 14–16, 2004. The meeting will be held at Strategic Analysis Inc., 3601 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 500, Arlington, VA.

Dated: November 29, 2004.

Jeannette Owings-Ballard,

*OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 04–28261 Filed 12–27–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Identifying and Sustaining U.S. Department of Defense/UK Ministry of Defence Defense Critical Technologies (Study) will meet in closed session on January 11, 2005, at Strategic Analysis, Inc., 3601 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, VA. This Task Force will develop a methodology to identify unique defense technologies as well as commercially developed technologies needing augmentation to fulfill defense niche areas, and then

apply the methodology to develop a list of defense critical technologies.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At these meetings, the Defense Science Board Task Force should focus its effort on high leverage, differentiated and transformational technologies. The Study may then use this list of defense critical technologies to further assess the tools available to the U.S. DoD or UK MoD to develop its critical technology needs. Some of the considerations the Study should examine include mechanisms to develop niches in pre-existing technologies, foster new technology until the commercial marketplace takes over, or develop technology without any expectation of commercial development; the analysis should include a review of the applicable acquisition/business case. Finally, the Study should consider the impact of technology development in other countries and the implications that this may have on Anglo-U.S. unique needs.

In accordance with Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 2), it has been determined that these Defense Science Board Task Force meetings concern matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and that, accordingly, these meetings will be closed to the public.

Dated: December 20, 2004.

Jeannette Owings-Ballard,

*OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 04–28262 Filed 12–27–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of Advisory Committee Meeting.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Management Oversight of Acquisition Organizations will meet in open session on January 10–11, 2005, and January 17–18, 2005, at SAIC, 4001 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA. This Task Force should assess whether all major acquisition organizations within the Department have adequate management and oversight processes,

including what changes might be necessary to implement such processes where needed.

The mission of the Defense Science Board is to advise the Secretary of Defense and the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology & Logistics on scientific and technical matters as they affect the perceived needs of the Department of Defense. At these meetings, the Defense Science Board Task Force will examine the oversight function with respect to Title 10 and military department regulations to ensure that proper checks and balances exist. The Task Force will review whether simplification of the acquisition structure could improve both efficiency and oversight.

In accordance with section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, Public Law 92–463, as amended (5 U.S.C. App. 2), it has been determined that these Defense Science Board Task Force meetings concern matters listed in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1) and that, accordingly, these meetings will be closed to the public.

Dated: December 20, 2004.

Jeannette Owings-Ballard,

*OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer,
Department of Defense.*

[FR Doc. 04–28263 Filed 12–27–04; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5001–06–M

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Office of the Secretary

Defense Science Board

AGENCY: Department of Defense.

ACTION: Notice of Advisory Committee meeting.

SUMMARY: The Defense Science Board Task Force on Red Lessons Learned will meet in closed session on December 16–17, 2004, at SAIC, 4001 N. Fairfax Drive, Arlington, VA. This Task Force will assess what useful information can our adversaries learn from U.S. military engagement and, particularly, what might they have learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom; identify the channels through which adversaries learn about U.S. capabilities; is there any evidence an adversary is adjusting to U.S. capabilities and what might the U.S. do to counter this; what are the indicators or observables that the Intelligence Community can focus on to determine if an adversary is engaging in this type of practice and do the indicators change in peacetime or wartime; do different technology insertion models exist; is there any evidence potential adversaries