

no.	Category	Posted Comments	Answers (in orginzal language)
1	question	Should the loss of potential revenue be determined by the inventor, government or third party?	Good question. I think this is really, REALLY hard. The government should get advice from experts in the private sector and the academia. In addition, the R&D pillar of the new economic security law includes a provision to create a new thinktank focusing on teasing out which emerging technologies are worth investing through this R&D program. The government should get advice from this new thinktank as well. (comment from the speaker)
2	question	How do you believe the loss of potential revenue by keeping technology secrete be valued? The inventor, government agency or third party?	
3	question	Igata-san, thank you for the briefing. However, Climate Security has become important urgently. Military must decrease GHG emission. Does the Economic-Security Promotion Law cover the carbon-nbeutral issues?	A single legislation cannot solve all problems. Having that said, climate security is critical. Militaries around the world are increasingly using green energy, including the Self Defense Forces. So how do you prioritise economic security goals, climate security goals, as well as myriads of other potential policy goals? The new National Security Strategy should answer this difficult question (if it's done right). (comment from the speaker)
4	opinion	今回の法案によって、DIMEうち、経済分野においても安全保障の体制が萌芽し、今後推進されていくものと認識しております。 一方で、DIME同士の連携は非常に難しいものではないかと考えております。 質問ですが、DIMEの横の連携はどのように進めていくのでしょうか。 担当部署や意思決定会議等があれば、ご教示下さい。 (例えば現在の4大臣会合に経済の機能も入れる等)	政治レベルでは岸田政権で始まった「経済安全保障推進会議」があります。議長は内閣総理大臣、それ以外に経済安全保障担当大臣や内閣官房長官、その他関連する大臣が出席者となります。この枠組みは現時点では経済安保推進法の制定に向けた準備作業としてしか使われていませんが、この枠組みの活用は考慮すべきかもしれません。そして、この決断を各省庁が実行し、その間に細かい省庁間調整を国家安全保障局が行う、という形になるかと思えます。(スピーカーからのコメント)
5	question	Mr. Schoff, about JUSSTIC, what kind of career should the member have? The role needs significant knowledge of both military technologies and private sector's technologies. I suppsse that few people can do that.	I think the important thing is to be an expert in his/her field of science and technology, so that they can share that with defense specialists. Kind of like a Defense Science Board or Defense Innovation Board in the US. They don't have to know both, they just need to be on the cutting edge of his/her own field. (comment from Mr. Schoff)
6	question	日本学術会議による防衛関連研究への参加妨害と中国への協力に対して、何らかの策を考える必要があると思います。日米英の産業界ができることは何かあるのでしょうか？ I think we need to consider some measures against the Science Council of Japan's obstruction of participation in defense-related research and its cooperation with China. What can the Japanese, U.S., and British industries do against them?	I would be reluctant to do anything that targets the Science Council directly, but there are some other measures that could help. The first would be to funnel more R&D funding through current or newly established Japanese government research institutes, which could accept scientists and researchers from around the country (including universities) to participate as visiting researchers or such. If the best equipment and the most dynamic research is available at these institutes, they should attract top talent (and it could also be a magnet for international talent and possibly public-private cooperative ventures as well). Combine this with some reform of decision making at universities (so that they do not require consensus and do not allow for anonymity in voting), for example, some kind of executive committee process similar to international universities with more transparent decision making, and perhaps this could make it harder for a few far-left professors to prevent universities from accepting defense-related funding. Even if defense money is not taken directly, dual use funding from civilian sources should be allowed, because they do not have a specific defense application. On this issue, business and government leaders need to speak up to explain that "dual-use" does not necessarily mean military use, and it is possible to fund R&D for general technological advances and commercial use, while allowing others later on to consider (and fund) defense application research. (comment from Mr. Schoff) デュアルユース技術の増加によって軍事と非軍事技術の境界がなくなりつつある中、そこへの意図的な線引きはそもそも難しい。研究、技術開発は制約を設けずに行い、結果として生み出された技術の使用用途に関しては国やその研究成果を出した本人に委ねるべき。 加えて、教育や研究においては、Academic Freedomの原則があるとおり、制約のない自由な意見交換や研究活動が尊重されるべきである。また、軍事を知らずして平和を語れないことも「平和を欲するものは戦争に備えよ」という箴言の通りである。日本学術会議はこれらを踏まえて、学問や研究のあり方を再考すべき。取り分け、中国は軍民両用を国家戦略とし、かつ先進諸外国の研究成果を様々な形で入手している実態を深刻に受け止め、その対応を直ちにとる必要がある。日米英の産業界ができることは限られているが、これらの原則を守るよう日本政府に要請するとともに、各国の国益に実害がでるような事例があれば、積極的に公表し、そのような事例を阻止するとともに、再発防止策の徹底を要求することが改善につながるのではないかと。(尾上元空将のコメント)
8	question	1- To HISAMITSU ARAI sensei Will the Japanese defense manufacturers such Mitsubishi, IHI Corp. and Kawasaki Heavy Industries support the Ministry of Defense 防衛省 with new technologies facing the threats from neighbouring countries?	日本の防衛産業は条件が合えば、新技術分野に関し、防衛省に協力するでしょう。 第1の条件は、新技術分野に関し、企業が経営計画を策定するのに必要な開発と調達計画を防衛省が策定すること、 第2の条件は、防衛省が企業に対し経営的に成り立つのに十分な代金を支払うことを明らかにすることです。(荒井先生のコメント)

9	question	2- To Dr. James Schoff Is the QUAD facing a new Axis calculation including Russia, China and North Korea?	I don't think the QUAD members see the QUAD in this way (that is, as an alliance of sorts designed to counter a group of potential adversaries). I think they see it as a way to support regional stability, democracy, and a rules-based order, and a way to cooperate for mutual benefit to maintain a competitive edge vis-à-vis China. The regional stability and deterrence purpose has an eye specifically on China too, but I don't think it goes beyond that to cover Russia or North Korea. It seems very focused specifically on the Indo-Pacific, in a way that seems disconnected from North Korea and Russia. (comment from Mr. Schoff)
10	opinion	I understand your image, thank you. However, those people may fall into the "talk only not action" because the same coordination has been tried among MoFA-Defense-Cabinet Office-METI but the challenge cannot overcome sectorialism (each group of specialty). JUSSTIC may be unrealistic.	You might be right, but somehow we need to tighten the loop of decision making that brings true science and tech experts (on the very cutting edge of their fields) together with the policy makers deciding how and where to make national security investments. Doing some of this in an alliance context will help, and perhaps the bilateral nature of this will help overcome sectarianism. (comment from Mr. Schoff)
11	question	To General Sadamasa Oue sensei In the future, will Japan look forward to the Arabian Gulf region as a market to its defence industry?	湾岸諸国は日本にとって重要なパートナー国であり、日本の安全保障にとってプラスになる装備移転は積極的に実施していくべきと考える。既に、日本国産の C-2輸送機やUS-2救難飛行艇などに関心を示す国が湾岸地域にもあるので、可能性は十分にあると思う。(尾上元空将のコメント)
12	question	I am not sure to whom I should ask this question, but who (which agency or command) should have the responsibility to conduct background investigations on works in the private sector, both defense industry and non-defense industry? How are we supposed to match up US and Japanese security clearance? I'm asking this question because, to my knowledge, there is no dedicated agency in Japan who oversees industry and has responsibility in defense counterintelligence and security for the private sector.	重要な質問だと思います。防衛省・自衛隊や政府機関の職員についての適格性審査はしるべき組織によって実施されている。一方、民間セクターについて既存のどの組織が主管となるべきか、または、そのための新たな組織を作るべきか、政治の責任で議論すべき課題だと考えます。(尾上元空将のコメント)
13	question	Japan, US and Europe all participate enthusiastically in international standardization activity, which is an important foundation for economic security. In the US and Europe, the defence manufacturers and their departments of defence often participate in these standardization activities. In contrast, I have never seen Bouei-shou participating. If the Bouei-shou does not adopt international standards, then this increases costs to industry and limits interaction between military and civil technologies. Do the panel think that Bouei-shou should and will become more active in international standardization activity?	従来は、日本は国際共同開発や装備の海外移転をあまり行ってません。そのため、日本の防衛省は国際標準化活動にあまり参加していません。今後は、国際共同開発や装備の海外移転を進める方針ですから、ご指摘の通り、国際標準化が必要になり、防衛省は国際標準化活動にもっと積極的になるべきですし、なるでしょう。(荒井先生のコメント)
14	question	Mr. Schoff, regarding Japan's new fighter jet project, collaboration between Japan and UK is strengthened while US defense industry is hesitant to disclose defense related information. What do you think of such tendency? Is there any atmosphere in US defense industries to improve openness by any chance?	A complex issue, but the short response is that often US defense industry wants to share more with allies but is held back by govt (i.e., DTSA). This trend will improve a little bit with allies over time, I think, but DTSA is always looking for equivalency, and there are still many differences in the US and Japanese systems. (comment from Mr. Schoff)
15	question	Oue-san, I agree with your opinion, which the Defense Equipment Export scheme must review its aim and operation scheme. However, your points focus on only conventional equipments. Now, world needs to engage in Climate Security. Rules to realize carbon-neutrality will influence military equipment and operations near future. When Japan should start accept the new rule, carbon-neutral?	気候変動・脱炭素の取組みはエネルギー政策はじめ多くの分野にまたがり、防衛装備品についてもその対象に含まれると思う。一方で、この課題については日本だけで取り組むことは困難であり、同盟国の米国はじめ有志国と歩調を合わせて取り組んでいくのが適切ではないか。(尾上元空将のコメント)
16	question	To increase the budget in the defence sector, what kind of discourse would you like to grow in the Japanese society in Japan?	ロシアによるウクライナ侵略を目の当たりにして、日本社会の危機意識もかなり高まっている。そのような状況を背景に、日本が直面する深刻な脅威とその脅威に対処する現実的な政策や戦略、そのために日本が保有すべき能力や装備について、冷静かつ実務的な議論が行われることを期待している。(尾上元空将のコメント)
17	question	防衛産業への中国等からの嫌がらせという視点もあると思いますが、引き抜きを警戒すべきだと思います。再生可能エネルギー、蓄電池、半導体、おそらく水素も、中国、韓国は日本よりも高額なサラリーで技術者を引き抜きます。日本の技術敗戦の歴史の失敗の本質は、こうした人材引き抜きに有効な手立てがないことにあるのではないかと思います。いかがでしょうか？民間企業の技術者が海外に流れることを止めることができないのでは？	日本の技術敗戦の歴史はご指摘のような事象の繰り返しから生じたものと当協会も感じています。経済安保推進法によって安全保障や防衛にインパクトを与え得る先進的なデュアルユース技術の情報漏洩や流出の防止に努める取組はようやく緒に就いたところですが、知財権等に関わる頭脳流出をどこまで防ぐことができるのかは規制だけでは難しいと思われまます。開発に貢献した個々人の成果に報いたり、会社や国のためにその知見を活用するインセンティブの検討など、総合的な対策が必要となるのではと考えています。これは中長期で留意すべき課題として、ルールを整備して、報告やモニター等による実態把握に努めながら、把握できた問題への対処策を講じることで、制度改善を推進するためのサイクルの整備などの地道な努力の積み重ねをしていく以外に解決策はないのではと考えています。(ISICからのコメント)

18	question	意図的または偶発的な情報漏洩に対する罰則が無ければ、クリアランス制度も片手落ちとなりますが、いわゆるスパイ防止法のような法律が必要ではないでしょうか？	機密情報にアクセスするためのセキュリティ・クリアランスを取得した有資格者には制度上、情報漏洩に対する罰則規定は不可欠です。意図的であろうが、偶発的であろうが、情報漏洩を防ぐために決められた手順・手続きに従わずに漏洩が発生させた場合は罰を受けることでコンプライアンスを徹底させることができるはずで、スパイ防止法は機密情報にアクセスできる有資格者から何らかの方法で盗み出そうとする側を罰するためのものであって、それも必要とは思いますが、まずは有資格者の情報漏洩を取り締まるための法整備を優先すべきではないかと考えます。その上で、前項と同じように報告やモニター等による実態把握に努めながら、把握できた問題への対処策を講じることで、制度の定着・浸透・改善を推進するためのサイクルの整備など地道な努力を積み重ねていくことが肝要と思います。(ISICからのコメント)
19	question	尾上さんのご意見の通りと思います。研究機関の成果を防衛産業向けに活かす、という工夫が足りないのではないのでしょうか？	防衛省は様々な工夫をしてきたと思いますが、それを妨害する勢力があること、また、防衛省以外の政府機関があまり関心を持たなかったことが問題だと思います。また、政府だけではなく、民間企業側も一層の工夫が求められているのではないのでしょうか。(尾上元空将のコメント)
20	question	To Mr. Schoff, as mentioned in one of the briefs, Japanese made a decision to work with Britain for the next fighter jet because of the US not sharing classified F35 information with the Japan. Now that Japanese made a decision to go with the Britain, what is the US plan to ensure air interoperability with Japan? We are talking about 30+ years ahead, but I am interested to hear your opinions on this.	I think the US side is genuinely satisfied with this end result, because it takes the pressure off the US to share lots of sensitive industrial secrets, but because our working relationship is good with both (and getting even stronger with UK via AUKUS), the US side seems confident that interoperability can be designed-in as the FX is developed. US-Japan work on a “loyal wingman” program will aid this effort, as will their continued cooperation on F-35 and F-15 upgrades in the future. We might still run into friction between Japan’s desire for independent upgradability versus the US “black box” approach to offering interoperable solutions, but it should be manageable if a means of interface can be established between the systems (like we often do with space technologies that have “docking” features that allow different components to be plugged into internationally developed systems). It won’t be easy, but a Japan-UK partnership is a good counterpart for the US to work through these issues, as the design and development comes together. (comment from Mr. Schoff)
21	question	To Jim Schoff — would be very helpful to have the recommendations on export policy, info security, etc. mentioned at the end of your talk in an additional slide. Perhaps you could add such a slide to your presentation for reference by ISIC members? Gregg Rubinstein	ご要望のあった追加情報を挿入した改訂版資料は こちら からアクセス願います。 Updated slides can be accessed from here .
22	opinion	大学の研究を防衛装備に向けさせるためには、全ての大学機関に期待しても現実的ではないです。防衛装備を研究する大学を特定し、そこに研究費の支援を厚くするという施策が必要だと思います。	ご意見ありがとうございます。