

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

RESOURCING HOMELAND SECURITY: *"THE WAY AHEAD!"*

by

Lieutenant Colonel Thomas A. Horlander
United States Army

Lieutenant Colonel Brent Bankus
Project Advisor

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The views expressed in this student academic research paper are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of the Army, Department of Defense, or the U.S. Government.

U.S. Army War College
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

Report Documentation Page			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188		
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 03 MAY 2004		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED -	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Resourcing Homeland Security: "The Way Ahead"				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Thomas Horlander				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Carlisle, PA, 17013-5050				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT See attached file.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 27	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Thomas A. Horlander
TITLE: Resourcing Homeland Security: "*The Way Ahead!*"
FORMAT: Strategy Research Project
DATE: 01 March 2004 PAGES: 27 CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

When President Bush established the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on October 8th, 2001, the newest Cabinet member of the Federal Government was given the tall order of ensuring that Americans never again relive the tragedies of September 11th, 2001. The resourcing implications of such an undertaking are overwhelming. The intent of this research paper is to provide a general understanding of the complexity and magnitude of resourcing homeland security (HLS) at the national level, and introduce concepts to improve the current federal government's homeland security resourcing construct.

This thesis briefly dissects the nation's homeland security resourcing equation – the Who, What, Where, When and How the country determines, prioritizes and allocates resources to provide for the security of the homeland. Discussion continues with analysis of the FY2004 federal HLS budget and concludes with some conceptual recommendations and governing principles the federal government should implement as the nation's homeland security construct matures and the DHS develops a supporting resource management system. The following policy recommendations support a more robust resource management system for the DHS and fall primarily into two categories: process engineering and engaging others. These two broad categories are subdivided into the topics of: 1) A Planning System to Combat Emerging Threats; 2) Resource Planning for the Out-Years; 3) A Codified Budget Process; 4) Engaging the Private Sector; 5) International Burden Sharing; 6) Clarification and Solidification of the NORTHCOM/DHS relationship and; 7) the Fifty States as Equal Partners. This study recognizes the DHS admirable progress in establishing a functioning resource management system and takes the opportunity to build upon its successes to develop and improve upon the current construct.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
RESOURCING HOMELAND SECURITY: <i>"THE WAY AHEAD!"</i>	1
LOTS OF MOVING PARTS.	2
2004: A PIVOTAL YEAR.....	5
HOMELAND SECURITY 2004 FUNDING – A <i>MACRO SNAPSHOT!</i>	6
CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE WAY AHEAD.....	8
PROCESS ENGINEERING	8
Resourcing the Out-Years.....	9
A Codified Budget Process.	10
ENGAGING OTHERS.....	11
Engaging the Private Sector.....	11
International Burden Sharing.	11
Clarification and Solidification of NORTHCOM/DHS Relationship.....	12
The Fifty States As Equal Partners.....	13
CONCLUSION	13
ENDNOTES	15
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

RESOURCING HOMELAND SECURITY: “THE WAY AHEAD!”

When President Bush established the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) on October 8th, 2001, the newest Cabinet member of the federal government was given the tall order of ensuring that Americans never again relive the tragedies of September 11th, 2001. In the future, political historians and commentators will likely posit that this decision compares in magnitude to the creation of the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) in the 1947 National Security Act and its impact on the U.S. government and the interagency process. Notwithstanding some cataclysmic destruction of the free world, these same historians will likely segue this discourse with some discussion about how the creation of the DHS was paramount to both U.S. and global security in the 21st century. While it is premature to postulate about the true impact establishing the DHS will have on national and global security, it is fair to say that it is a watershed event in U.S. politics and an overwhelming endeavor critical to the security of the American homeland. Resourcing this effort can only be described as paramount to the number one *survival interest* of the United States of America – security of the homeland.

There was no time to learn to walk. Since its nascent beginnings when President Bush’s officially signed Executive Order 13228 less than one month after the September 11th attacks, the DHS has sprinted out of the starting blocks at a blistering pace. Its performance can be considered successful since another catastrophic event has not occurred on the U.S. homeland since its creation. President Bush selected Pennsylvania Governor Tom Ridge as this country’s first Assistant to the President for Homeland Security.¹ He charged Ridge to assemble a team to build a new Presidential cabinet office in record time. This new enterprise would coordinate the efforts of some forty eight federal agencies and refocus the country’s energy and resources on *develop(ing) and coordinate(ing) the implementation of a comprehensive national strategy to secure the United States from terrorist threats or attacks.*² Simply put by Secretary Ridge in his 2004 testimony to the House Select Committee, DHS’s mission is to “*detect and prevent (terrorism against the U.S.) while, at the same time work to respond and recover from acts of terrorism.*”³ While there should be no question in the minds of Americans what the prize is in this marathon race, it will remain unclear where the running track will twist and bend and where the finish line lies. It is this road untraveled, not its destination that is most challenging to the nation’s leadership and the security of the U.S. homeland.

The common denominator of these challenges is resourcing. The most masterful of plans and strategies are worthless if not properly resourced and conversely, hold the potential of netting unintended consequences when only partially resourced. With the DHS still in a true

state of infancy (only two years old), the environment is ripe to institutionalize systems and processes before bureaucratic tendencies render these possibilities insurmountable. Furthermore, as time passes and the nation distances itself from the tragic events of September 11th, it will become increasingly difficult for law makers and the national leadership as the taxpayer's resolve fades.

This thesis dissects and evaluates the current HLS resourcing equation, examines the current DHS resourcing levels and proposes recommendations to construct an efficient and comprehensive HLS resource management system. These policy recommendations will focus on both internal DHS operations and the federal government's budget processes. They support a more robust DHS resource management system and are divided primarily into two broad categories: process engineering and engaging others. Within each of these categories are several initiatives to both exploit the success of the DHS's organizational and administrative achievements and create a more viable, effective and efficient resource management system. Properly implemented, these initiatives will collectively produce a flexible resource allocation solution commensurate with the strategic objectives and priorities established by the federal government.

LOTS OF MOVING PARTS.

Governments (local, state and federal) and the private sector (to include private citizens) were investing in homeland security well before September 11th, 2001. However, it is extremely difficult to quantify pre-September 11th, 2001 homeland security expenditures, since many were called something else. Judging by the absence of available pre-September 11th, 2001 HLS budgetary data, even the experts are hesitant to venture an estimate on resourcing levels. While much has transpired in the homeland security arena since September 11th, 2001, the determination of aggregate resourcing levels is still elusive and will likely continue.

This dichotomy can be explained through a cursory dissection of today's resourcing equation. Before exploring the different variables of this equation, the federal government's definition of its desired product – homeland security should be revisited. The very definition lends to the "fog and fuzziness" of the equation. According to the National Strategy for Homeland Security, "Homeland security is a concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America's vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur."⁴ This definition poses two defining challenges to the administration. First, out of operational necessity, the DHS purposely gave the definition a broad focus to empower it to marshal the country's efforts and national resources with minimal

jurisdictional constraints. Yet, the DHS is restricted by its inherent nature as an instrument of the federal government and a competitor for resources with numerous other federal agencies. It is further limited in its influence over the private sector, which is the largest source of homeland security resources.⁵ These two limitations, prevent the DHS from synergizing the entire pool of resources to net the most effective allocation of the nation's HLS resources. Second, while there are distinct advantages to defining national programs in general terms, it often allows for loose and varied interpretations of them. The resultant unintended consequences of these diverse interpretations often mean a less than optimal allocation of scarce resources to support these programs.

WHO? Almost Everybody! Prior to September 11th, 2001, homeland security was a secondary mission to over 100 agencies and programs operating in a confusing, bureaucratic matrix.⁶ Today, these same agencies are reorganized (twenty-two are part of DHS) and are all part of the HLS resourcing equation. These programs are financially controlled by many of the thirteen Congressional Budget subcommittees having oversight responsibilities for homeland security policy.⁷ As well, fifty state and hundreds of local governments spend federal, state and local monies on HLS. The private sector, comprised of businesses, corporations and private citizens, also contribute resources to the homeland security effort.

WHAT? Money and Manpower! A primary purpose of all national strategies is to provide a vision and focus to the country's leadership on how to best allocate the nation's energy and resources. In more practical terms, where should the government apportion the monies of the federal budget – which programs and to what level? The National Strategy for Homeland Security states that “the United States spends roughly \$100 billion(B) per year on homeland security. This includes the private sector and the services of federal, state, and local law enforcement and emergency services but excludes most armed forces spending.”⁸ The federal budget for DHS is only one-third of this estimate. The Fiscal Year 2004 budget request for the DHS totals \$36.2B and marks a 64% increase in funding from two years ago.⁹ By comparison, this is still less than 10% of the FY2004 DoD Budget of \$401B and a meager four percent of the discretionary outlays of the FY2004 Presidential Budget request. While the DHS has significantly increased its manpower through reorganization, it is still significantly smaller compared to other departments. The DHS now has a total of 180,000 federal employees in its workforce, but still pales in comparison to the DoD total workforce and is even smaller than the Department of the Army civilian component of 205,000 federal employees.¹⁰

WHERE? Home and Abroad! By definition, expenditures on homeland security are meant to prevent terrorism within the United States.¹¹ This should not be misconstrued that the

expenditure is to occur within the geographical boundaries of the United States. Clearly, the work of a U.S. consulate in a foreign country deliberating on a VISA to a foreign national contributes to this end. Following this logic, the Afghanistan campaign to destroy Taliban and Al Qaeda forces is conceptually an HLS effort. It prevents terrorists from conducting operations in the U.S. homeland achieving the same end only through a different ways and means. This simple parallel begs the clarification of when is an expense for homeland security or a related federal program directed towards the fight against terrorism?

WHEN? *Annually!* Federal homeland security resources are appropriated on the same fiscal year timeline as other government expenditures. Given the criticality of the program in the wake of September 11th, the rigidity of the federal bureaucracy, the codified federal budget process and competing security programs, it seemed the only logical approach. The nation was forced to tackle the homeland security resourcing behemoth with little time to engineer a homeland security specific resource management system. To date, DoD is the only anomaly with its two-year budget cycle and multi-year appropriations.

HOW? *Effective But Less Than Perfect!* With no precedence or historical funding levels, determining logical homeland security resourcing levels was an almost impossible order in 2001 and early 2002. Before and shortly after the creation of the DHS, a coherent, systematic process to marshal the nation's resources into a homeland security budget was nonexistent. Today's system is still wanting for a codified and institutionalized financial management system comparable to the DoD Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System (PPBS). Executive Order 13228 does not empower the DHS with any budgetary authority outside its own department. It only provides the DHS authority to "certify to the Director, the funding levels that the Assistant to the President for Homeland Security believes are necessary and appropriate for the homeland security-related activities of the executive branch."¹² Therefore, the degree in which the DHS under the current system has influence on non-DHS homeland security funding levels within the President's budget is largely dependent on interagency cooperation and his personal relationship with the President of the United States (POTUS).

This limited evaluation of today's HLS resourcing equation clearly indicates that the current HLS resourcing construct understandably has some painful maturing ahead. The system is in an infantile state and the availability of accurate information is testimony to this. When citing pre-September 11th, 2001 factual data, authors avoid absolutes and favor the use of disclaimant words to qualify their information as uncertain and often the best guess solution. An acceptable level of comfort in the accuracy of HLS resource reporting has existed only since the creation of the DHS. Perhaps the only element of this equation in which one should feel

some degree of certainty is that the program is managed on an annual (fiscal year) basis, even though this too may prove problematic as many programs are multiyear in nature.

2004: A PIVOTAL YEAR

In the two years following the September 11th, 2001 attacks, the country has made significant progress in establishing a framework to provide for homeland security. Today, there exists the Department of Homeland Security and a Homeland Security Council (HSC) with several subordinate committees¹³ similar to the National Security Council. In July 2002, the DHS published the nation's first National Strategy for Homeland Security. The DHS now manages a substantial and growing portion of both the federal budget and workforce. More importantly, the DHS enjoys the strong leadership and experience of Secretary Ridge and is fully supported by President Bush and his administration. With most of the critical pieces in place, the logical segue is a maturation process. With time, this construct will emerge from its nascent stages and manifest itself into an effort that maximizes the sum of its parts. With time, it could potentially achieve parity with the other principal actors of national security in terms of importance and criticality to the country's survival.

This year (2004) is the first year in this maturing process and a pivotal year for U.S. homeland and national security. There are several major events on the menu in 2004 that will significantly impact the future of the U.S. homeland security effort. First, the global war on terrorism (GWOT) abroad is in its decisive stages in both Afghanistan and Iraq. Both operations are ultimately intended to destroy transnational terrorist networks and the environments in which they flourish, deny them access to weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and secure the homeland from terrorist attacks – the staple mission of the DHS. Second, 2004 is a presidential election year, and its outcome may have significant impact on the DHS, its role in the federal government and how the country's future leadership pursues homeland security. Third, although designated as "operational" in October 2002, 2004 truly marks the first full year of coordinated operations of the new unified command – the U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) whose primary mission is to provide for the defense of the land, sea and air of the continental United States from external threats.¹⁴ Fourth, with a funding level of \$36.2B for 2004, a 7.4 percent increase from the 2003 level and a 64 percent increase from the 2002 level¹⁵, Congress and other oversight groups in the federal government e.g. the Government Accounting Office (GAO) will be increasingly watchful. They will require more and more, that the DHS demonstrate the effectiveness of its programs and provide more detailed and comprehensive reports that directly tie funding levels to results. Lastly, accepting the

hypothesis that Al Qaeda and other major transnational terrorist organizations typically strike on a biannual basis, the United States could witness another major terrorist attack on the homeland or one of its national interests in 2004. While other developments will impact at varying degrees on the homeland security efforts in 2004, these events will have a considerable impact and will manifest themselves in future HLS resourcing levels.

HOMELAND SECURITY 2004 FUNDING – A MACRO SNAPSHOT!

For its primary mission, DHS is focusing on national border and transportation security functions, merging response activities, creating a central point to match terrorist threats against critical infrastructure vulnerabilities, and coordinating homeland security research and development efforts.¹⁶ The President's 2004 HLS budget request of over \$36B supports this focus and allocates resources into 6 primary categories generally aligned with the above areas, distributing monies primarily to fifteen governmental agencies. This distribution strikes a balance between the proactive DHS's mission of detecting and preventing terrorism against the U.S. and the reactive mission of responding and recovering from acts of terrorism. The following descriptions of these six categories illustrate this balance and highlight the government's priorities.

Securing the Nation's Borders and Transportation Systems accounts for the largest portion of the 2004 homeland security budget with a requested funding level of \$18.1B. This request is twice that of 2002 and primarily allocates resources to the Bureau of Customs and Borders Protection, the Bureau of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and the Transportation Security Administration. They fund 1) the 60,000 plus employees added since 2002 to increase airport security; 2) the Administration's "smart borders" initiative that identifies threats before they enter the U.S.; 3) an "entry-exit system to track visitors to the United States; 4) operations of the Transportation Security Administration and; 5) support to the nation's first responders – state and local law enforcement and firefighters.¹⁷

The 2004 request for funds in the category of *Securing the Nation's Ports and Ensuring Safety in Our Waters* is more than \$6.1B. This supports the U.S. Coast Guard and maritime safety and security operations to include search and rescue and the "Deepwater" program, which is designed to upgrade the U.S. Coast Guard's fleet of cutters, aircraft and related command and control, computer and intelligence systems.¹⁸

The third largest portion of the homeland security budget is to *Prepare for and Respond to National Emergencies* – to include major terrorist incidents and natural disasters. The federal disaster relief budget request totals nearly \$6B for 2004 (a 16 percent increase over the 2003

funding level). Other significant expenditures in this category include \$400M to maintain and strengthen the Strategic National Stockpile of Drugs and another \$890M for drugs and vaccines to protect Americans from bioterrorism.¹⁹

The *Advancing and Harnessing Science and Technology* category experienced the most dramatic increase in requested funding for 2004 with an \$803M budget, constituting a 43% increase over the 2003 funding level and a seven-fold increase since 2002. The expenditure will fund science and technology research to improve the government's ability to detect and counter chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear attacks.²⁰

The category of *Improving Information and Analysis and Infrastructure Protection* requires \$829M. This program supports and improves the governments' capabilities to analyze and identify potential threats while concurrently assessing vulnerabilities.²¹

The 2004 DHS budget includes funding of \$1.8B for Citizen and Immigration Services. This includes \$500M for the continuance of the President's initiative to *Improve Immigration Services* primarily by reducing the backlog of applicants awaiting VISA and U.S. citizenship.²²

Other smaller programs e.g. funding for the U.S Secret Service, round out the 2004 homeland security budget to over \$36B, but excludes the \$6.7B²³ Defense Homeland Security funding of the President's Defense Budget. While these six major funding categories do not account for the entire DHS 2004 budget, this cursory examination illustrates the macro level relationship between the DHS's mission, the Presidential HLS initiatives and funding levels. This relationship exemplifies the success of the current resource management system at the strategic level.

Secretary Ridge's 2004 Budget Summary is clear and supports the initiatives and priorities he and the President established. The greatest challenge in the budgeting process lies in the inherent interagency nature of homeland security and the corresponding fragmented allocation of resources to support HLS programs. This becomes evident when comparing the DHS's 2004 federal budget request of \$36B and the 2004 Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, HR 2555 signed into law on October 1, 2003. The bill appropriates \$29.4B for operations and activities of the DHS and constitutes a \$1B increase (3.7 percent)²⁴ over the amount the president requested in his original budget submission.²⁵ Simply stated, the DHS 2004 budget request calls for \$36.4B but the HLS appropriation provides only \$29.4B, leaving an \$8B delta appropriated in other bills, not directly controlled by the DHS. This comparison demonstrates the fragmented allocation of homeland security funds at the highest levels of the national government. As the monies are further allocated (and allotted) to the end-user, the fog

of financing homeland security both thickens and deepens, making fund control a financial manager's nightmare.

The coordination efforts required to craft the federal homeland security budget in the labyrinth of federal and state departments and agencies are complex and cumbersome. Execution of the same budget is equally complex being left to over fifty federal agencies with competing priorities, bureaucratic norms, and different interpretations of the authorizations and appropriation bills that provided the funding. The dilemma for the resource managers is very similar to that of the chef who slices a pie into twenty pieces. Where pieces of the pie's crust and filling are inadvertently left in the dish to be discarded as waste, so are some of the homeland security resources unintentionally consumed at less than maximum effectiveness.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE WAY AHEAD

Every leader and manager in both the public or private sector, is responsible for managing resources. Managers in the federal government are no different except most are charged with being stewards of what government comptrollers refer to as "other people's money" e.g. taxpayer dollars. Additionally, at the higher echelons of the federal government, funding levels are quite significant. While the direct funding for the DHS is substantial, it is clearly not the largest portion of the federal budget and pales in comparison to DoD.

However, one should not be deceived by this comparison, as the DHS holds the unique position within the President's Cabinet of indirectly wielding extraordinary influence and power over the largest budget in the world. With few exceptions, the Director of Homeland Security is the only executive authority to certify the necessity and appropriateness of the funding levels (for homeland security) of other executive branch cabinet members and federal agencies. This authority demands a strategic vision complemented by a viable and synchronized resource management system that ensures the realization of that vision. While DHS resource management efforts have been successful in supporting the President's vision for homeland security, it needs to maintain focus on the future and continue to search for ways to ameliorate its efforts. The following general recommendations are arranged into two broad categories – process engineering and engaging others. The discussions of each are designed to provoke conceptual thinking and focus future administrative and management efforts to resource homeland security.

PROCESS ENGINEERING

A Planning System to Combat Emerging Threats. Threats to the U.S. homeland are abundant and too numerous to address in their entirety. Our cursory analysis of the 2004 HLS

budget reveals the U.S. governments' strategy is to keep terrorists and their capacity to commit acts of terrorism outside the confines of the United States. In fact, two-thirds of the 2004 budget request (*Securing the Nation's Borders and Transportation Systems* and *Securing the Nation's Ports and Ensuring Safety in Our Waters*) is meant to fund this very purpose. Few would argue the criticality of this mission or whether it is the most effective means to protect the homeland. Conversely, few would argue that it is possible to do in the absolute sense.

The inherent nature of liberty and freedom allows the terrorist to hide behind the diversity of our country and renders the U.S. homeland vulnerable to terrorism - a risk that democratic societies are committed to take or risk becoming (what the terrorists aspire for) a martial-law society. The remaining one-third of the 2004 HLS budget provides for response capabilities, improving the U.S. government's ability to detect WMDs and improving capabilities to analyze and identify potential threats and vulnerabilities. While caution should be exercised on being overly critical of the DHS's efforts to balance the reactive vs. proactive programs necessary for a viable homeland security effort, questions on threat assessment criteria are warranted. One should ask whether the focus of our resources is commensurate with the threat assessment. Does the U.S. have the proper balance between what is needed to address both the enemy's most likely and most dangerous acts of terror? Are our resources focused on what the terrorists have done in the past or what they are likely to do in the future? Should we be protecting airplanes or power grids? How do we know we have a synchronized effort?

These questions require a planning construct similar to the DoD's Joint Strategic Planning System where there is a direct correlation between threats, strategies, objectives and programs. Clearly, the \$839M allocated in the 2004 HLS budget to improve the government's ability to analyze and identify potential threats while concurrently assessing vulnerabilities is a positive step to establishing this relationship. A viable and formalized planning system codified by law is needed to properly ensure we have our resources focused on and aligned with emerging threats to the homeland.

Resourcing the Out-Years.

While securing the homeland is an immediate interest and objective of the federal government, its realization is not. Recently in the media, the question *du jour* has been, "Is America more secure today than on September 10, 2001?" In his September 2, 2003 remarks to the American Enterprise Institute, Secretary Ridge eloquently answers this question with a resounding "yes," citing a number of developments and improvements to American security.²⁶ Research also indicates the answer is a marginal "yes", though most Americans responded by

saying, “No.”²⁷ If perception is reality, then the U.S. government has its work cut out for it before Americans can see the elusive finish line referred to in this paper’s introduction. In essence, recapturing the sense of security Americans had before September 11, 2001 may take decades and will require long-term resource planning. This plan should not be built on the perceptions of the American public but on the realities of homeland security – realities that a federal homeland security system takes years to build and requires an extraordinary level of consistent resourcing to be effective. These realities also demand a resource management system that logically programs resources to support long-term goals and accounts for the myriad of challenges and uncertainties inherent to the federal budget process.

A Codified Budget Process.

The saving grace for a Department of Defense financial manager is federal legislation and DoD directives. They provide structure and order to an otherwise chaotic, competitive food fight between hundreds of DoD officials who all want the same thing – a strong defense! In DoD, that saving grace is the statutory-based PPBS, established in 1962 by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and the annual Defense Authorization and Appropriation Acts. Like the PPBS system, founded on a Rand Corporation study, Victoria A. Greenfield of the same organization has recently proposed a HLS federal resourcing system comparable to its DoD counterpart. In her study, *The Role of the Office of Homeland Security in the Federal Budget Process – Recommendations for Long-Term Engagement*, she recommends a top-to-bottom-to-top approach to HLS budgeting before the submission of a formal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) request and certification.²⁸ Her study proposes a HLS budgeting construct that is synchronized with the federal budget process and provides a framework similar in some respects to the PPBS. This need for a comprehensive, codified financial management system was documented by the United States General Accounting Office (GAO) in their April 11, 2002 report entitled “Homeland Security – Responsibility and Accountability For Achieving National Goals.” Among the GAO’s findings, first and foremost was “the need for a statutory-based structure for leading, coordinating and evaluating the nation’s homeland security to help ensure an effective approach and appropriate accountability to Congress and the American people.”²⁹ This system codified in federal statutes is imperative to the long-term effectiveness and efficiency of the DHS. Similar to PPBS, federal legislation must establish a structured and systematic process. The process should be designed to take inputs from a broad range of organizations, organize and prioritize them into a coherent program, represent them to the POTUS and Congress and then distribute those resources for budget execution. Given the

breadth and scope of the federal homeland security construct and the uncertain fiscal environment of the government, simplicity and flexibility must be the key to this system. While codifying this system is critical, more vital to its effectiveness is the manner and discipline in which it is implemented throughout the federal government.

ENGAGING OTHERS

Engaging the Private Sector.

While it is not certain how much America spends on homeland security, clearly the U.S. government is not the greatest contributor. Of the \$100B estimated annual spending on homeland security in 2002, only \$22B was spent by the federal government.³⁰ However, the question is, does private sector spending truly complement the DHS in an optimal fashion. Or is there an opportunity for the federal government to provide incentives for private businesses to share a portion of the burden in a synchronized fashion and in support of the government's programs? These incentives could be effectuated through a variety of instruments such as corporate income tax deductions/exemptions or shared project funding. Similar to federal grants provided to state and local governments, the federal government could also provide grants and/or low interest loans to businesses for common homeland security interests. Additionally, the manner in which the federal government properly rewards the private sector for embracing initiatives that enhance homeland security for the general public should be investigated. Initiatives of this nature have significant political and legislative implications and would require the federal government to establish industry standards and safeguards for participant companies. These initiatives would require further study but have potential to enhance the national effort of securing the homeland.

International Burden Sharing.

Securing the homeland includes much more than just CONUS or North American continent operations. The previous example of a consulate processing VISAs and passports for foreign nationals who desire to enter the U.S. is a prime example. Their activities clearly have a direct impact on homeland security. Yet, excluding the almost daily coordination with Canada and Mexico, today's DHS efforts are largely domestic in nature. There is very limited activity with primarily western countries and coordination with certain Department of State activities that cross over into the DHS's area of interest. The partnering with other nations to fund common homeland security interests also warrants further study. In addition to intelligence sharing, diplomatic exchanges and defense arrangements, DHS and its international counterparts should

explore the opportunities for shared multi-national initiatives. Possibilities may include partnerships in research, development and acquisition projects, training exchanges and creating an international forum for discussion either as part of an international body like the UN or a separate entity. The long-term sustainability and effectiveness of the DHS is heavily dependent on its ability to develop and sustain the strategic partnership with willing countries committed to a secure and free way of life. In the 21st century, homeland security can not be approached as a national problem. It is an international issue that requires a global cooperative effort to be successful in the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT).

Clarification and Solidification of NORTHCOM/DHS Relationship.

It is perhaps fair to characterize the nascent relationship between NORTHCOM and the Department of Homeland Security as undetermined. While the DHS mission is homeland security and domestically oriented, NORTHCOM is responsible for homeland defense (HLD) which DoD defines as the military protection of United States territory, domestic population, and critical defense infrastructure and assets from external threats and aggression.³¹ Its mission is to exercise command over all forces that operate within the United States in response to external threats and in support of civil authorities.³² The challenges associated with this mission are not only numerous and complex but, militarily unique to NORTHCOM. They range from establishing an organization integrated into non-DoD systems, and coordinating and training with these nonmilitary entities at federal, state and local levels. NORTHCOM must furthermore harness existing and future military capabilities to complement capabilities found in the civilian sector, while satisfying the unique legal requirements associated with using the military within the United States. NORTHCOM also faces the more familiar challenges of resource constraints and providing realistic training opportunities to ensure readiness.

It is important to note that HLD is a military mission and the NORTHCOM commander answers to the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) and not the DHS. Notwithstanding this distinction and the myriad of challenges the establishment of NORTHCOM presents to an already complicated homeland security construct, the opportunities to enhance the nation's HLS capabilities are significant. Since DoD is the largest recipient of discretionary federal tax dollars, this relationship promises greater capabilities. If the nation's newest Unified Command matures into a bona fide combatant command (COCOM) on par with CENTCOM or EUCOM and partner with the DHS and other HLS-oriented agencies e.g. FEMA, the nation's capacity to provide for a safer homeland should improve greatly. Paramount to the realization of a more formidable and

viable homeland security operation is the continued cultivation of this partnership between NORTHCOM and DHS.

The Fifty States As Equal Partners.

Critical to the national homeland security effort is the development and sustainment of an equal partnership between the federal and state's governments. This requires that all stakeholders embrace the concept that the nation's homeland security strategy is not a federal strategy but a national one and state governments have significant responsibilities. These responsibilities include ensuring the existence of a relevant and ready National Guard capable of conducting homeland security missions, conducting good fiscal management of homeland security resources and/or conducting both intra and interstate emergency action training exercises.

It is incumbent upon the federal government to ensure that its resource management systems provide states with an opportunity to articulate those requirements that the federal government wishes to consider for funding. Conceptually, the system must provide both a top-to-bottom and bottom-to-top process where local and state requirements are communicated at the appropriate level. This system hinges upon solid federal-state and state-local partnerships which require frequent maintenance. It is only through these partnerships that all levels of government can ensure resource requirements are accurately represented and subsequent funding is allocated. Only when the nation can adequately address hometown security needs will the homeland be truly secure.

CONCLUSION

Since the events of September 11th, 2001, the United States has reengineered its capacity to secure the homeland. It created the Department of Homeland Security, consolidated organizations, merged functions, passed key legislation and has embarked on a mission where failure is not an option. One could liken this endeavor to building a manufacturing plant where the bulk of the machinery has been installed, the workforce hired and operations are underway. The operations are complex, cumbersome and resource intensive but are adequate for initial production. The company's long term success in this rapidly changing business environment will require some process reengineering and a more coordinated management effort that provides flexibility and effectiveness throughout the organization. This "new manufacturing plant" scenario offers some important insights for the future of the DHS. As recommended in the study, the DHS will need to continue to reengineer its processes, and design a comprehensive resource management system that engages all parties involved in providing

homeland security. Its focus must be broad and futuristic, its processes simple and flexible and its results timely and effective.

A vast difference between the previously mentioned business scenario and the nations' homeland security operations is the cost of failure. Failure of the federal government to secure the homeland of the United States of America could mean an end to the American way of life, democracy, liberty and world freedom. With so much at stake, it is clear that resourcing the number one survival interest of the U.S. should remain at the top of the government's agenda. Furthermore, it is incumbent upon everyone within the homeland security community to ensure that we continue to develop and mature a system that resources those objectives articulated in the National Strategy for Homeland Security and secures the homeland for future generations.

WORD COUNT=5693

ENDNOTES

¹ The White House, "Executive Order: Establishing Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council," October 8, 2001, Section 1. In subsequent legislation, the DHS was established as a Cabinet member on equal footing with the other 14 Presidential cabinet members and the "Assistant to the President" title was changed to "Secretary."

² The White House, "Executive Order: Establishing Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council," October 8, 2001, Section 3.

³ Tom Ridge, "Statement of Department of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge Before the House Select Committee on Homeland Security," June 2003; Available from <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?theme;> Internet Accessed 22 August 2003.

⁴ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "National Strategy of Homeland Security," July 2002, 2.

⁵ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "National Strategy of Homeland Security," July 2002, 63.

⁶ U.S. Executive Office of the President, "Department of Homeland Security." *In Budget of the U.S. Government: Fiscal Year 2004*, February 3, 2003; Available from [http://w3.access.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2004/pdf/budget/;](http://w3.access.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2004/pdf/budget/) Internet Accessed 22 August 2003, 142.

⁷ Victoria Greenfield, "The Role of the Office of Homeland Security in the Federal Budget Process: Recommendations for Effective Long-term Engagement," February 2002, xiii.

⁸ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "National Strategy of Homeland Security," July 2002, 63.

⁹ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "Budget in Brief FY2004," Available from <http://www.dhs.gov/bib2004.html>; Internet Accessed 22 August 2003, 1.

¹⁰ Army Budget Office, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management Comptroller, Headquarters, Department of the Army, "The Army Budget Green Book," February 2003, 13.

¹¹ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "National Strategy of Homeland Security," July 2002, 2.

¹² The White House, "Executive Order: Establishing Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council," October 8, 2001, Section 3(l).

¹³ George Bush, "Homeland Security Presidential Directive-1. SUBJ: Organization and Operation of the Homeland Security Council." October 29, 2001. The committees of the HSC include a Homeland Security Council Principals Committee (HSC/PC) as a senior interagency forum for homeland security issues, a Homeland Security Council Deputies Committee (HSC/DC) as the senior sub-Cabinet interagency forum for consideration of policy issues affecting homeland security and Homeland Security Council Policy Coordination Committees (HSC/PCCs) charged with coordinating the development and implementation of homeland

security policies by multiple departments and agencies throughout the Federal government, and coordinating those policies with State and Local governments.

¹⁴ James Russell, "NORTHCOM to Coordinate DOD Role in Homeland Defense," *Strategic Insights*, May 6, 2002, 1.

¹⁵ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "Budget in Brief," Available at <http://www/dhs/gov/dhspublic>, Internet accessed on 23 August 2003, 1. This does not include the 2002 Supplemental of \$11.5B provided for homeland security.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Ibid, 1-2, 6-9.

¹⁸ Ibid, 2, 9-11.

¹⁹ Ibid, 2-3, 11-12.

²⁰ Ibid, 3, 14-16.

²¹ Ibid. 3, 13-14.

²² Ibid, 4-5, 17.

²³ U.S. Executive Office of the President, "Summary Tables." *In Budget of the U.S. Government: Fiscal Year 2004*, 2004, 315.

²⁴ Michael Paddock, "Funding & Appropriations: Preparing to Address FY04 Funding," *Homeland Defense Journal*, October 2003, 8. The \$1B increase consists of an additional \$504M for the Office of Domestic Preparedness, firefighters and emergency management and \$405M for the Transportation Security Administration and the Federal Air Marshal Program.

²⁵ Michael Paddock, "Funding & Appropriations: Preparing to Address FY04 Funding," *Homeland Defense Journal*, October 2003, 8.

²⁶ Tom Ridge, "Securing America in a Post 9/11 World," 2 September 2003; available from <http://usinfo.state.gov>; Internet; accessed 16 January 2004.

²⁷ Business Week, "Is America Safer Today?" 24 September 2003; available from <http://www.businessweek.com>; Internet: accessed 16 January 2004. BusinessWeek Reader Survey produced similar result to other national surveys. Pointed questions about airline and skyscraper safety, U.S. law-enforcement & intelligence gathering capabilities produced on the average 30-35% positive response that the U.S. is more secure than a year ago.

²⁸ Victoria A. Greenfield, "The Role of the Office of Homeland Security in the Federal Budget Process – Recommendations for Effective Long-Term Engagement," Rand Corporation, February 2002.

²⁹David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, "Homeland Security – Responsibility And Accountability For Achieving National Goals," United States General Accounting Office, 11 April 2002, 1.

³⁰ U.S. Office of Homeland Security, "National Strategy of Homeland Security," July 2002, 63.

³¹ U.S. Department of Defense, "The Role of the Department of Defense in Supporting Homeland Security," Department of Defense, September 2003, 1.

³² James Russell, "NORTHCOM to Coordinate DoD Role in Homeland Defense," *Strategic Insights*, 6 May 2002, 1.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Army Budget Office, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Financial Management & Comptroller, Headquarters, Department of the Army. *The Army Budget Green Book*, February 2003. Internet: Accessed on 30 September 2003. <http://www.asafm.army.mil>
- Bush, George W. Executive Order (EO) 13228. *Establishing the Office of Homeland Security and the Homeland Security Council*, 8 October 2001. Internet: Accessed on 23 August 2003. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2001/10/20011008-2.html>
- Bush, George W. Executive Order (EO) 13260. *Establishing the President's Homeland Security Advisory Council and Senior Advisory Committees for Homeland Security*, 19 March 2002. Internet: Accessed 21 October 2003. <http://www.fas.org.ird/offdocs/eo/eo-13260.htm>
- Bush, George W. Executive Order (EO) 13284. *Amendment of Executive Orders, and Other Actions in Connection with the Establishment of the Department of Homeland Security*, 24 January 2003. Internet: Accessed 23 August 2003. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030124.html>
- Bush, George W. *Homeland Security Presidential Directive-1 SUBJ: Organization and Operation of the Homeland Security Council*. 29 October 2001. Internet: Accessed 21 October 2003. <http://www.fas.org.ird/offdocs/nspd/hspd-1.htm>
- Business Week, "Is America Safer Today?" 24 September 2003; available from <http://www.businessweek.com>; Internet: Accessed 16 January 2004.
- Greenfield, Victoria A. *The Role of the Office of Homeland Security in the Federal Budget Process: Recommendations for Effective Long-Term Engagement*. Santa Monica: Rand, February 2002. 37pp. (HV6432.G62 2002)
- Martin, Bob and Leslie Knapp "Homeland Security Enhanced By Defense Appropriations Bill" *United States Senator – South Dakota Tim Johnson News Release*, 04 December 2001. Internet: Accessed on 22 August 2003. <http://johnson.senate.gov/~johnson/releases200112/2001C06417.html>
- McHale, Paul "Statement by Mr. Paul Hale Before the 108th Congress Senate Armed Service Services Committee," U.S. Senate." 08 April 2003.
- Paddock, Michael "Homeland Defense Funding Requests are Away, but Where Will They Land?" *Homeland Defense Journal Online*, 30 May 2003. Internet: Accessed on 16 June 2003. <http://www.homelanddefensejournal.com>
- Paddock, Michael "Funding & Appropriations: Preparing to Address FY04 Funding." *Homeland Defense Journal Vol 1, Issue 7*, October 2003.
- Ridge, Tom *Statement of Department of Homeland Security Secretary Tom Ridge Before the House Select Committee on Homeland Security*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2003. Internet: Accessed on 22 August 2003. <http://www.dhs.gov/dhspublic/display?theme>

- Ridge, Tom "Securing America in a Post 9/11 World." 2 September 2003. Available from <http://usinfo.state.gov>. Internet. Accessed 16 January 2004.
- Russell, James "NORTHCOM to Coordinate DoD Role in Homeland Defense." *Strategic Insights*, 6 May 2002. Monterey, CA: Center for Contemporary Conflict, 2002.
- U.S. Department of Defense. *The Role of the Department of Defense in Supporting Homeland Security*, Washington: Department of Defense, September 2003. 27pp.
- U.S. Department of the Interior. "Budget Supplemental Strengthens Interior's Homeland Security Initiatives," *Office of the Secretary NEWS*, 15 January 2001. Internet: Accessed on 22 August 2003. <http://www.di.gov/news/020115a.html>
- U.S. Executive Office of the President. "The Budget Message of the President." *In Budget of the U.S. Government: Fiscal Year 2004*, 1-7. Washington: Office of Management and Budget, 2004. (HF2051 .A3 FY2004)
- U.S. Executive Office of the President. "Department of Defense." *In Budget of the U.S. Government: Fiscal Year 2004*, 77-90. Washington: Office of Management and Budget, 2004. (HF2051 .A3 FY2004)
- U.S. Executive Office of the President. "Department of Homeland Security." *In Budget of the U.S. Government: Fiscal Year 2004*, 141-161. Washington: Office of Management and Budget, 2004. (HF2051 .A3 FY2004)
- U.S. Executive Office of the President. "Summary Tables." *In Budget of the U.S. Government: Fiscal Year 2004*, 311-332. Washington: Office of Management and Budget, 2004. (HF2051 .A3 FY2004)
- U.S. Office of Homeland Security. *Budget in Brief*, Washington, D.C.: Office of Homeland Security, 2003. Internet: Accessed on 23 August 2003. <http://www/dhs/gov/dhspublic>
- U.S. Office of Homeland Security. *DHS Organization*, Washington, D.C.: Office of Homeland Security, 2003. Internet: Accessed on 23 August 2003. <http://www/dhs/gov/dhspublic>
- U.S. Office of Homeland Security. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Homeland Security, July 2002. 1 vol. (HV6432 .N17 2002)
- U.S. Office of Homeland Security. *DHS ReOrganization Plan*, Washington, D.C.: Office of Homeland Security, 25 November 2002. Internet: Accessed on 23 August 2003. <http://www/dhs/gov/dhspublic>
- U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *Circular No. A-127 Revised SUBJ: Financial Management Systems*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Management and Budget, 23 July 1993. Internet: Accessed on 30 September 2003. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a127/>
- Walker, David M. *Homeland Security: Responsibility and Accountability for Achieving National Goals*, Washington: U.S. General Accounting Office, April 2002. 16pp. (HV6432 .W35 2002)

Wise, Charles R. and Rania Nadir. "Organizing the Federal System for Homeland Security: Problems, Issues, and Dilemmas." *Public Administration Review* 62 (September 2002): 44-57. Database online. Available from ProQuest. Accessed 01 October 2003.

