

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO IMPROVING US SECURITY FORCE ASSISTANCE EFFORTS

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL THERESA BAGINSKI

United States Army Reserve

COLONEL BRIAN CLARK

United States Army

LIEUTENANT COLONEL FRANK DONOVAN

United States Marine Corps

MS. KARMA JOB

Department of Army Civilian

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOHN KOLASHESKI

United States Army

COLONEL RICHARD LACQUEMENT

United States Army

COLONEL DON ROACH

Australian International Fellow

COLONEL SEAN SWINDELL

United States Army

LIEUTENANT COLONEL CURT VAN DE WALLE

United States Air Force

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A:

Approved for Public Release.

Distribution is Unlimited.

USAWC CLASS OF 2009

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, PA 17013-5050

The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle State Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this 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 this 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 Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 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 any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE (DD-MM-YYYY) 16-03-2009		2. REPORT TYPE Strategy Research Project		3. DATES COVERED (From - To)	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE A Comprehensive Approach to Improving US Security Force Assistance Efforts				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Lieutenant Colonel Theresa Baginski, Colonel Brian Clark Lieutenant Colonel Frank Donovan, Ms Karma Job Lieutenant Colonel John Kolasheski, Colonel Richard Lacquement Colonel Don Roach, Colonel Sean Swindell Lieutenant Colonel Curt Van De Walle				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Colonel Michael McMahon Department of Military Strategy, Planning, and Operations				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army War College 122 Forbes Avenue Carlisle, PA 17013				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Distribution A: Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT Current operations, the demands of persistent conflict, and the enduring national security interests of the United States underscore the immediate and continuing need to improve US Security Force Assistance (SFA) efforts. The frequency and importance of such activities throughout US history demonstrate that the current requirements are not anomalies. Since 9/11, the United States has been challenged to accomplish key national security goals due to a lack of capability and capacity to effectively advise, utilize and partner with foreign security forces. To meet this challenge, this paper offers recommendations that build upon recent initiatives within DoD to create a comprehensive approach to improve US Security Force Assistance. At the heart of our recommendations is a DoD-level organizational approach to effectively institutionalize SFA activities and facilitate interagency and multinational unity of effort. We intend to adapt current DoD processes that encourage the ad hoc approach and implement a single DoD-level integrating organization.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Building Partner Capacity; Security Cooperation; Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR); Building Partnerships; Security Assistance					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UNLIMITED	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 42	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT UNCLASSIFIED	b. ABSTRACT UNCLASSIFIED	c. THIS PAGE UNCLASSIFIED			19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

USAWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO IMPROVING US SECURITY FORCE
ASSISTANCE EFFORTS**

by

Lieutenant Colonel Theresa Baginski
United States Army Reserve

Colonel Brian Clark
United States Army

Lieutenant Colonel Frank Donovan
United States Marine Corps
Ms Karma Job

Department of Army Civilian
Lieutenant Colonel John Kolasheski
United States Army

Colonel Richard Lacquement
United States Army
Colonel Don Roach

Australian International Fellow
Colonel Sean Swindell
United States Army

Lieutenant Colonel Curt Van De Walle
United States Air Force

Colonel Michael McMahon
Project Adviser

This SRP is submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Master of Strategic Studies Degree. The U.S. Army War College is accredited by the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association of Colleges and Schools, 3624 Market Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, (215) 662-5606. The Commission on Higher Education is an institutional accrediting agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation.

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

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Lieutenant Colonel Theresa Baginski, Colonel Brian Clark
Lieutenant Colonel Frank Donovan, Ms Karma Job
Lieutenant Colonel John Kolasheski, Colonel Richard Lacquement
Colonel Don Roach, Colonel Sean Swindell
Lieutenant Colonel Curt Van De Walle

TITLE: A Comprehensive Approach to Improving US Security Force Assistance Efforts

FORMAT: Strategy Research Project

DATE: 16 March 2009 **WORD COUNT:** 8133 **PAGES:** 42

KEY TERMS: Building Partner Capacity; Security Cooperation; Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR); Building Partnerships; Security Assistance

CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

Current operations, the demands of persistent conflict, and the enduring national security interests of the United States underscore the immediate and continuing need to improve US Security Force Assistance (SFA) efforts. The frequency and importance of such activities throughout US history demonstrate that the current requirements are not anomalies. Since 9/11, the United States has been challenged to accomplish key national security goals due to a lack of capability and capacity to effectively advise, utilize and partner with foreign security forces. To meet this challenge, this paper offers recommendations that build upon recent initiatives within DoD to create a comprehensive approach to improve US Security Force Assistance. At the heart of our recommendations is a DoD-level organizational approach to effectively institutionalize SFA activities and facilitate interagency and multinational unity of effort. We intend to

adapt current DoD processes that encourage the ad hoc approach and implement a single DoD-level integrating organization.

A COMPREHENSIVE APPROACH TO IMPROVING US SECURITY FORCE ASSISTANCE EFFORTS

The United States is unlikely to repeat another Iraq or Afghanistan—that is, forced regime change followed by nation building under fire—anytime soon. But that does not mean it may not face similar challenges in a variety of locales. Where possible, US strategy is to employ indirect approaches—primarily through building the capacity of partner governments and their security forces—to prevent festering problems from turning into crises that require costly and controversial direct military intervention. In this kind of effort, the capabilities of the United States' allies and partners may be as important as its own, and building their capacity is arguably as important as, if not more so than, the fighting the United States does itself.

—Secretary of Defense Robert Gates,
January 2009¹

Current operations, the demands of persistent conflict, and the enduring national security interests of the United States underscore the immediate and continuing need to improve US Security Force Assistance (SFA) efforts. The frequency and importance of such activities throughout US history demonstrate that the current requirements are not anomalies. Since 9/11, the United States has been challenged to accomplish key national security goals due to a lack of capability and capacity to effectively advise, utilize and partner with foreign security forces. To meet this challenge, this paper recommends the creation of a new organization as a means of overcoming current bureaucratic impediments and providing a coherent focus on SFA challenges.

Previous US advisory experience with similar requirements did not result in institutionalized capabilities that would have forestalled major problems. Instead, US SFA efforts have been largely ad hoc ventures. The United States should have had expertise, plans, authorities, and organizational solutions readily at hand to address the full range of partnership activities when the inevitable crises arose. The Department of

Defense (DoD) must act now to avoid future SFA difficulties and to ensure that it does not squander the hard-won lessons of recent experience. DoD is long overdue for a comprehensive approach to SFA that supports Geographic Combatant Commander's (GCC) Theater Campaign Plans (TCP) and contingency operations in a manner that integrates US military assistance activities from ministerial through tactical levels, while providing strong links to complementary interagency and multinational activities.

This paper offers recommendations that build upon recent initiatives within DoD to create a comprehensive approach to improve US Security Force Assistance. At the heart of our recommendations is a DoD-level organizational approach to effectively institutionalize SFA activities and facilitate interagency and multinational unity of effort. We intend to adapt current DoD processes that encourage the ad hoc approach and implement a single DoD-level integrating organization. Expertise in key SFA activities, massed and integrated within a DoD-level organization, offers the best opportunity to improve hitherto disjointed efforts. This single integrator can be successful only with simultaneous change to DoD's authorities and policies.

According to the DoD's draft instruction on relationships and responsibilities for Security Force Assistance, SFA "is defined as: 1) operations, actions, or activities that contribute to unified action to support the development of the capacity and capability of foreign security forces and their supporting institutions; 2) the bolstering of a foreign security force or institution's capabilities or capacity in order to facilitate the achievement of specific operational objectives shared with the USG."² SFA includes the tasks of organizing, training, equipping, rebuilding and advising (OTERA) foreign security forces and foreign security institutions.³

The problem of improving US SFA has received substantial attention lately. Many good ideas are circulating and there are various useful solutions in early stages; nonetheless, great shortcomings still plague the general effort. The ad hoc approach to Security Force Assistance efforts during persistent conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan has been, at best, inefficient and slow. To a degree, the US has developed effective approaches for specific contingencies, such as in Iraq and Afghanistan; however, the delays in finding effective ways have come at a high price and have postponed, if not compromised, mission success. It would be a mistake to ignore the wisdom gained through several years of painful adaptation; this paper proposes a solution that would prevent such a misstep by leveraging recent experience to prepare and enable future US forces engaged in building partner capacity.

There are four main sections in this paper. The first section outlines the US requirement for SFA. The second describes the problems that confront DoD in effectively executing SFA. The third section describes a proposed organizational solution by specifying the basic functional requirements and authorities needed for an SFA organization, with a proposed structure to meet those requirements. The fourth section provides illustrative vignettes that demonstrate employment of the organization in representative scenarios of varied scale.

Scoping the US SFA Requirement – What Do We Need

The current US National Defense Strategy states, “The best way to achieve security is to prevent war when possible and to encourage peaceful change within the international system. Our national strategy emphasizes building the capacities of a broad spectrum of partners as the basis for long term security.”⁴ In consonance with

this, the National Military Strategy commits US forces to “...facilitate the integration of military operations with allies, contribute to regional stability, reduce underlying conditions that foment extremism and set the conditions for future success.”⁵

SFA, as a set of activities, can make a direct contribution to the achievement of the US national goals stated above. Moreover, SFA is a cost-effective way to leverage defense capabilities. Benefits of SFA activities can include:

- Prevention or containment of local and regional conflicts
- Denial of terrorist havens
- Prevention of state collapse
- Reinforcement of partners' abilities to effectively secure their populations
- Maintenance of strategic access
- Sustainment of forward presence

The importance of such an approach is made more critical in light of the acute pressures created by the current global economic crisis—a crisis that Dennis Blair, the new Director of National Intelligence, notes as, “The primary near-term security concern of the United States”.⁶ In short, SFA offers a low-cost, high-payoff stabilization alternative to a more costly intervention option.

United States engagement with foreign security forces will consist of a range of integrated military and interagency activities that change in nature over time based on a number of national policy factors, such as:

- The level of value to US national security interests in a country/region
- The level of internal security threat to the government of a partner nation
- The level of external security threat to a partner nation

- The capability and capacity of a nation's security forces
- The relative advantage to the United States of an alliance relationship

The intent of SFA activities is to improve the capabilities of allies and other partners as well as the quality of relationship between the United States and such partners. Each SFA effort is unique and must be framed to accommodate both US objectives and the concerns and constraints of foreign partners. The United States may conduct SFA activities to complement broader diplomatic or economic engagement, to aid another government's security activities, and to enhance coalition operations in which the United States participates. The scope, duration and nature of SFA activities can vary, reflecting differing strategic relationships between the United States and partner nations. Successful SFA activities end only when they have achieved their goals or when either the United States or partner nation concludes that they have become unnecessary or unproductive.

Typically, GCCs and ambassadors require tailored, interagency US SFA support to ensure a nation can address internal security concerns, external threats and territorial defense. SFA activities should also accommodate the desire of more capable nations to contribute to regional/global security missions and multinational peacekeeping operations. Host nation internal security demands require the building and sustaining of security institutions capable of management, support, training, and operations. The United States can best help our partners accomplish this through a dedicated and integrated whole of government approach rather than through the ad hoc approach of recent years.

The future joint force may find it increasingly necessary and desirable to pursue its objectives by enabling and supporting partners, whether these partners are friendly states, international organizations, or some other political entity. This is particularly relevant in an environment fraught with challenges related to the emerging concepts of irregular warfare.⁷ Future joint operations may require US forces to minimize their own visibility by operating in a supporting role and allowing partners to take the lead. Mounting such indirect operations will more likely succeed where prior SFA activities by US armed forces (such as military advice, operational planning, foreign military sales and security assistance) have laid the political and military groundwork for success.⁸

The GCC security cooperation tasks within the TCPs must effectively align with and complement the actions and activities of other agencies and departments. This is particularly important to achieve a more expansive and whole of government approach in foreign countries where SFA must be integrated with the US Chief of Mission (usually the ambassador) and the country team. The United States can undertake many SFA activities as part of the TCP to meet mutual capability development objectives. These may include:

- Military training team visits
- Exercise participation
- Defense security infrastructure construction and revitalization
- Equipment provision and training
- Intelligence sharing
- Sustained engagement and long term advisor presence
- Institutionalization of security forces training capacity

- Ministerial engagement
- Service engagement

The type and nature of forces conducting a particular SFA mission deserve special consideration, dependent on political acceptability, access, an assessment of the foreign partner's forces, and on the need for specialized forces, equipment, or skills. Conceptually, US forces should be prepared to train and advise foreign security forces, assist the professionalizing of such forces, and support the development of institutions to meet a wide range of potential demands, including major combat operations (MCO), irregular warfare (IW), and stability, security, transition, and reconstruction (SSTR) operations. The goal is for the GCC to employ a tailored force whose core competencies and level of training provide the required capability to initiate, improve or sustain an operation aimed at building partner capabilities and capacities.

The Problem – It's Always Ad Hoc

The United States has extensive experience advising and partnering with foreign armed forces, starting with the Spanish-American War, but particularly since World War II. The most difficult missions have been the large-scale advisory and partnering efforts associated with major wars (Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan, and Iraq). The most recent large-scale efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq suffered from initial inefficiencies and reduced effectiveness associated with “reinventing the wheel” for advisory and partnering efforts. This is indicative of two interrelated problem areas: 1) the absence of enduring institutional support for SFA activities to manage the domains of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, and facilities

(DOTMLPF) coherently; and 2) the absence of unity of effort for SFA support to the GCCs during mission execution.

In large-scale advisory efforts, the US military has resorted to numerous makeshift organizational structures and the diversion of large numbers of military personnel to duties for which they were not adequately prepared.⁹ The Services have generally seen large-scale advisory duties as an aberration and have not sought to institutionalize mechanisms for effective advisory and partnering activities.¹⁰ Even with recent experience, some within DoD see SFA as a temporary problem that will go away when forces depart Iraq and Afghanistan, an impression reinforced by the fact that DoD has not clearly articulated the force employment requirements for conducting SFA globally.

Despite lessons learned, little enduring capability for building partner capacity above the tactical level is resident in current DoD institutions or approaches. Existing DoD guidance permitted the creation of ad hoc SFA capabilities with little joint or interagency integration or lasting competence. Inside this multitude of ongoing activities, there is no single proponent that integrates all activities to provide a common overarching direction and can coordinate, justify, and prioritize requirements for MCO, IW and SSTR. The draft SFA DoDI designates USSOCOM as the Joint SFA proponent.¹¹ However, the SFA instruction does not address how we achieve unity of effort in integrating all aspects of SFA from the ministerial to the tactical level, or how to best address SFA as part of the GCCs' TCPs. In short, it still advocates an ad hoc approach to SFA, albeit one with a lead agent.

Moreover, the focus on USSOCOM presents other difficulties. To the degree that the other services accept SFA activities, they are largely perceived as Special Operations Forces (SOF) responsibilities. USSOCOM can be quickly overwhelmed by the scope of global SFA demands, at which point they view the problem as a global joint sourcing problem. USSOCOM is collaborating with the other organizations with equity in this arena to develop global joint sourcing recommendations to leverage general purpose forces (GPF) for SFA requirements.¹² The SOCOM-lead approach and way ahead does not institutionalize, manage, or organize institutional and operational support to build partner nations security forces' ministries.

The lack of a comprehensive national SFA concept and SFA institutional mechanisms resonates at the operational level. The net effect is that support to the GCCs who have the responsibility to execute SFA activities in contested environments is not adequate. GCC staffs do not have the expertise, resources, and guidance that allow them to develop effective, comprehensive SFA campaign plans in their regions. Major impediments inherent in the current US approach to SFA that are manifest at the GCC level include:

- Lack of authority to coordinate, integrate, prioritize and de-conflict SFA among the other combatant commands, services, DoD Agencies and other governmental departments
- Inability to tap into a trained and ready pool of subject matter experts (SME), civilians and military, for advising at all levels
- Inability to provide tailored, scalable packages to accomplish SFA tasks

- Inability to readily tap into GPF for SFA efforts, and a reluctance by leadership to be pulled away from their traditional core competencies
- Lack of ready access to lessons learned, knowledge, and experience at all levels
- Inability to adequately track SFA funds and other resources to support SFA in theater

Additional challenges are presented by the numerous laws and regulations that govern the various aspects of security assistance, foreign internal defense (FID), counter-drug, humanitarian assistance, and theater security cooperation (TSC) activities. To conduct effective SFA activities across the entire spectrum of operations, authorities and funding need to be straight forward, understandable, and streamlined for the GCC and Ambassadors.¹³ Though beyond the scope of this paper, clearly there is need for a comprehensive review of fiscal and other authorities that support SFA activities.

An Organizational Approach to SFA – More Than Just a New Organization

Reorganization and integration of existing DoD SFA activities will permit more effective actions to achieve national security objectives.¹⁴ DoD must institutionalize SFA activities and create a new paradigm for the manner in which we provide support to GCCs. Current policy, requirements, and doctrine for SFA reflect the need for a more effective organizational approach to support GCC-led SFA activities and provide a DoD link to broader interagency and multinational SFA-related endeavors (such as efforts undertaken by country teams and the Department of State (DoS) Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS)).

While the GCCs, in conjunction with ambassadors, coordinate and synchronize the execution of SFA in their areas, there is a need for a single coordinated effort at the national level to institutionalize and rationalize the support provided to these executives. For DoD, this could be a single proponent responsive to the Secretary of Defense (SecDef) with authorities and other resource support streamlined for responsiveness to SFA requirements. This organizational approach must enable DoD unity of effort in coordinating DoD's actions with those of the other governmental organizations and with international partners.

The primary role of the single SFA proponent would be that of lead advocate for DoD operational and institutional SFA functions. Operational SFA tasks address all aspects of OTERA at all levels of partner nations' security forces. Institutional tasks conducted by the organization must include supporting all aspects of DOTMLPF in order to manage SFA activities in support of GCCs and ambassadors more effectively. To enhance the unity of effort in employment of SFA activities in support of the GCCs, the organization's structure must be permanent in nature, and must have the ability to expand and contract to support the GCCs throughout the spectrum of conflict, while at the same time managing the institutional support requirements for DoD.

A Single Integrator for SFA. The mission of a new Defense Security Force Assistance Agency (DSFAA) would be to focus (lead, advocate, and integrate) all DoD SFA activities in support of the GCCs and ambassadors through unified action involving the Joint, Interagency, Intergovernmental, and Multinational (JIIM) community to generate, employ, sustain, and assist partner nation and regional security forces in support of a legitimate authority.¹⁵ To provide comprehensive SFA support for the GCCs

and ambassadors, DSFAA must serve as the integrator for SFA across DoD, while also serving as an interface across the JIIM environment. It must have relationships and tendrils that run through the various services, across the GCCs and into other departments and agencies, as well as with our multinational partners.

We considered a range of options for placement of this organization, including the following:

- Under the executive agency of one of the Services (most likely the Army)
- As an element under either Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) or Special Operations Command (SOCOM)
- As an element within the Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA),
- As a new agency under the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy USD(P).

We analyzed the options considering the potential for comprehensiveness and strategic focus, the authority resident in its placement in the DoD hierarchy, how well it leveraged existing assets (facilities, budget, etc), the demonstrated acceptability by other major stakeholders across the JIIM environment, and the benefit of the physical location for integration of SFA operations. Our analysis of these criteria led to our recommendation to establish a new defense agency dedicated solely to SFA as the best option for achieving success.¹⁶ DSFAA should be established within OSD under the authority, direction, and control of the USD(P). Additionally, we recommend the agency report through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Global Security Affairs (ASD(GSA)).¹⁷ The agency's headquarters should be in Washington DC. The Director and Deputy Director would be appointed by the USD(P). The Director should be a three-

star military flag officer, and the deputy should be a civilian member of senior executive service (SES).

Establishment as a DoD Agency-level organization would place DSFAA at the right level to influence the entire DoD as well as to serve as an interface with other JIIM actors. It also would allow the organization to mature without being inhibited by the norms and paradigms of an existing organization. Additionally, it represents the necessary organizational framework to focus attention on SFA within the Building Partnerships Joint Capability Area.

DSFAA must work closely with many other organizations to leverage their capabilities and facilitate SFA integration. In particular, DSFAA must have strong links with the combatant commands, the Services, and DSCA. DSFAA's primary focus is to support the geographic combatant commands in execution of SFA operations around the world. DSFAA must possess expertise and authority to link with and leverage the unique operational and tactical capabilities of SOCOM as well as to integrate SOF capabilities with General Purpose Forces. Similarly, DSFAA must work closely with the Joint Staff, JFCOM and the Services to guide important SFA adaptations across DOTMLPF domains.

Within OSD, DSFAA must work closely with DSCA to leverage its expertise in the management and administration of security assistance programs, while recognizing that other aspects of SFA, such as planning, operational design, and combat advising, clearly transcend DSCA's existing expertise and role in managing security cooperation activities.

DSFAA would also provide the DoD link for SFA to US interagency partners (such as DoS, Department of Justice (DoJ) and Department of Homeland Security (DHS), among others) in broader whole-of-government efforts such as stabilization and reconstruction, rule of law, and other international support programs. DSFAA would also operate closely with international and multinational SFA partners.

DSFAA would have within its ranks DoD personnel, military and civilian, that are ready, trained, and available to support and enhance the GCC's SFA activities. DSFAA would have a permanent staff assigned that is charged with coordinating, integrating, and advocating institutional changes within DoD to better enable execution of SFA activities. A core enabling competency of DSFAA would be its ability to deploy task-organized teams of SFA SMEs in support of GCCs and ambassadors. The organization would provide scalable SFA activities to support steady-state TSC, MCO, IW and SSTR. Later in this paper, we provide notional vignettes of the anticipated ability of this organization to task-organize and meet various SFA requirements.

A Multi-Role Organization with a Single Focus. To accomplish the above stated requirements, the organization is structured to conduct operational and institutional SFA tasks vertically between various levels. For purposes of this paper, we use the term operational SFA tasks to refer to the support provided to employment of SFA activities. Institutional SFA tasks are those that better enable DoD to manage SFA activities (such as common doctrine on how to conduct SFA, streamlined procedures for determining equipment requirements and procuring that equipment, common SFA training for personnel designated to support the GCCs in conducting SFA activities, etc.)

DSFAA would provide an inherent ability to vertically integrate efforts to build, train, and advise partner nation's security force establishments from the ministerial through tactical levels. This includes providing trained teams to assess requirements in conjunction with the GCC, and experts to assist the GCC in executing the appropriate SFA activities. Additionally, DSFAA provides support to the GCC in building a partner nation's security forces institutional capability, closely integrated with the concurrent work to build effective units. The proposed organization would also perform operational SFA activities horizontally—that is, integrated training, advice, and support to partner nations' security forces across all functions, coordinated with the other agencies of the partner nation's government. For example, DSFAA may coordinate on behalf of a GCC for support by national or state/local law enforcement agencies to help organize and train a partner nation's border police.

DSFAA would integrate DOD's efforts to better manage how we conduct SFA activities. It would coordinate with all DoD organizations in developing common DOTMLPF solutions for SFA, from all levels (tactical units through ministerial). DSFAA would also be DoD's proponent to coordinate the department's SFA activities and resources with those of other government agencies. We anticipate that DSFAA would be the advocate in coordinating SFA activities, resources and processes with our international partners. This would enable a more common approach to conducting SFA by various nations, particularly in those cases where several nations are working with the same partner nation's security forces.

A key institutional function performed by this organization would be to assist in the development of SFA policy as part of US national security strategic guidance

documents. For example, DSFAA would help shape the guidance the SecDef provides to the GCCs for security cooperation in the GEF. In addition, DSFAA would coordinate policy development, to include potential legislative proposals, with other US agencies that are leading efforts to enhance the capability and capacity of partner nation entities, to include non-military security forces and intelligence services.¹⁸ DSFAA can also assist the GCCs in developing the security cooperation portion of their TCP, and then review and comment on the TCPs that the GCCs submit to the SecDef to better enable consistency of national SFA efforts. In the course of mission execution, DSFAA would review requests for forces (RFF) and assist in validating requirements. This would help ensure consistency of policy and guidance to nest SFA activities with overall national security objectives.

Right Person, Right Place, Right Time. A shortfall in the current system is managing the Department's personnel to enable placing the right person in the right position to support SFA. DSFAA would assist DoD and the Services in adjusting or developing personnel system mechanisms to identify, track, and manage individuals with key SFA competencies. DSFAA would then assist in managing DoD's available source of manpower to ensure requisite expertise through a tiered approach, recognizing that while the agency would be small, it provides a powerful multiplier effect by maintaining a program to train joint personnel (military and civilian) and assist in managing those personnel. DSFAA would also maintain an institutional method to train large numbers of personnel, in conjunction with the Services and force providers, when required. This management function would likely include maintaining links to other non-DoD agencies' personnel management systems.

In order to provide tailored, scalable teams to perform a range of SFA activities on behalf of the GCCs, we envision a three-tiered approach for managing personnel against SFA requirements:

- Tier I - Personnel that meet SFA required competencies would be identified from within the DoD civilian and military ranks and would be assigned to the DSFAA full time. Tier I personnel would receive training on how to conduct SFA-specific tasks and obtain a SFA competency identifier. Tier I personnel would be deployable and make-up the core of subject matter experts that would then provide support to the Geographic Combatant Commander's SFA activities.
- Tier II - Personnel with specific skills of use in SFA activities from within DoD, or identified through agreement with another agency (or even through agreement with a multinational partner), but not assigned to DSFAA. DSFAA would identify and request Tier II personnel as required to meet specific needs that cannot be filled by Tier I personnel. Tier II personnel would also receive training on how to conduct SFA-specific activities, and receive a competency identifier prior to being identified as Tier II. For example, a partner nation may require SFA support with respect to the budget process at the Ministry level. Given this validated requirement, DSFAA would identify and request a particular Tier II individual, from a budget office, that meets the above requirement. Since that Tier II person is already trained, he would generally be available to support an SFA mission within 30-45 days of notice.

- Tier III – The broader population of military and civilian personnel—and even units—would provide the ability to expand the mission to encompass large-scale efforts. Whereas Tiers I and II are primarily focused on the identification and management of small numbers of SMEs, Tier III encompasses the potential identification, preparation, and use of much larger number of SMEs and units. Tier III may include the activation of reservists, retirees and non-government civilians. These personnel receive specific training in SFA only after the requirement is identified and they are activated for an SFA mission. At that time, they would receive joint training on how to conduct SFA activities (the Services and Agencies are responsible for non-SFA tactical training). In conjunction with the Services, JFCOM, and SOCOM, the DSFAA would maintain a capability to expand its existing joint SFA-specific training rapidly to accommodate large numbers of Tier III personnel and units designated for SFA operations. It would also include the capacity to form the basis of an in-country coordinating agency for a large scale enduring requirement.

Clarifying Authorities and Funding. To empower this organization to better accomplish SFA activities, DoD needs to centralize and focus key authorities and funding. Ideally, authorities and funding should be aligned under Title 10 for DoD to have the flexibility to expeditiously tailor and execute SFA programs. Centralizing the authorities and funding within DoD would not alleviate the need for DoD to closely coordinate and work with the DoS on proposed SFA activities.

A particularly valuable improvement would be the designation of DSFAA as DoD lead to execute Section 1206¹⁹ authority to globally train and equip foreign military

forces. The authority and funding should be given to the proposed DSFAA to centrally manage and administer so SFA activities can be appropriately identified, prioritized and funded.

There are also other authorities and funding which could be used for SFA activities (such as Section 1208, Combatant Commander's Initiative Funds, counterdrug, Foreign Military Financing (FMF), Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI), and Peacekeeping Operations (PKO)). DSFAA would act as the lead coordinator to obtain funding to carry out SFA activities, within the intended authorities, by closely working with the GCCs, Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA), DoS, and others as required.

Further, this proposal recommends reestablishment of the defunct "Special Defense Acquisition Fund (SDAF)"²⁰ which would allow DoD to procure standard, generic equipment (M-16s, AK-47s, body armor, helicopters, etc.) to be purchased and warehoused in advance for SFA training and equipping requirements. Special authorization and funding would be needed in order to reestablish such an equipment program.

As an early task, DSFAA should review laws and regulations in order to reduce limits on the ability to effectively conduct SFA activities while nonetheless acknowledging oversight requirements. For example, we should seek the necessary authority to allow DoD to provide police training and assistance and expand Section 1206 authority to extend to training and equipping foreign police and security forces in conjunction with the DoS, DoJ, and DHS (this program is currently limited solely to foreign military and maritime security forces). DSFAA should also work with DoS

counterparts (particularly in the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs (PM), S/CRS and the US Agency for International Development (USAID)) to review pertinent laws and regulations.

Organizational Design. There are two guiding principles for designing DSFAA. First, it must be as small as possible and resourced using existing military and civilian personnel authorizations from throughout DoD.²¹ Second, it must be built to provide a core of operational support immediately available to the GCCs while coordinating DOTMLPF for DoD.




Figure 1: Proposed Defense SFA Agency Structure

The proposed DSFAA would include a headquarters element and staff, Liaison (LNO) Teams, a Political-Military Affairs Office, and an Office of Strategic Communication. The centerpieces of the agency are the Operational Assistance Directorate and the Institutional Assistance Directorate. A wiring diagram of the proposed Defense Security Force Assistance Agency is shown in Figure 1.

There are two sets of LNO teams that are unique to this organization: 1) LNO teams provided to other governmental organizations and international partners, and 2) LNO teams habitually aligned with the GCCs. These teams are critical to facilitate SFA coordination and communication across DoD, other US governmental departments and agencies, and US partners, as appropriate. Additionally, we expect that other government organizations would find it beneficial to provide teams to DSFAA to further enable strong coordination.²²

The Operational Assistance Directorate (OAD), in coordination with other US agencies and supported GCCs, conducts assessments, advises, and trains Foreign Security Forces to better enable foreign partners to build and sustain their institutions. Structurally, it consists of six Divisions (Police, Defense, Counter-Terrorism, Intelligence, Customs and Border Protection Division, and Logistics)²³ and has the capability to deploy tailored Security Force Assistance Support Teams (SFAST) task-organized from within DSFAA to support global operational requirements. Divisional expertise would be as follows:

- Police Division would, in conjunction with DoS and DoJ, advise and train foreign police forces so that they build self-reliance. This includes the civilian and law enforcement personnel that are responsible for enforcing the rule of

law. There are three subordinate sections under this division: Local Police Services, National Police Services, and Internal Affairs.

- Defense Division would advise and train foreign military forces to ensure that they are capable of directing, training, sustaining and developing armed forces required to counter threats to their country's national security. The Division would also assist in developing institutional and operational capacity as well as support enablers. There are four subordinate sections under this division: the Joint Headquarters, Army, Air Force, and Maritime Services.
- Counter-Terrorism Division would, in conjunction with other US agencies, advise and train a country in the development of a national counter-terrorism capability to enable it to defeat terrorism and deny the use of its territory as a terrorist safe haven.
- Intelligence Division would, in conjunction with other US agencies, advise and train the partner nation in developing a national intelligence capability to enable security forces to counter domestic and external threats to peace and stability more effectively.
- Customs and Border Protection Division would, in conjunction with DHS, advise and train domestic border enforcement organizations on how best to control border crossings and prevent the infiltration of terrorists, criminals, narcotics and other illicit goods into the country.
- Logistics Division would assist the partner nation in developing and/or improving capabilities to sustain its security forces.

Operationally, this directorate can support GCC security cooperation activities and, in a time of crisis, form the nucleus of an advisory headquarters responsible for the synchronization of all SFA activities in a particular country or operation under the command and control of the GCC. Additionally, an SFAST may be DoD's SFA component in a DoS-led operation to "help stabilize and/or reconstruct a society that is in transition from conflict or civil strife, so they can reach a sustainable path toward peace, democracy and a market economy".²⁴ As required, the SFAST would reach-back to or pull forward SFA SMEs.

The other major component of DSFAA is the Institutional Assistance Directorate (IAD). The IAD would be the primary element for the management of SFA information and expertise to coordinate common DOTMLPF solutions across and beyond DoD. Serving as a single proponent for activities that are currently found across multiple agencies and services within DoD, the IAD would provide all organizations that have a role in SFA with a synergistic, comprehensive, and common approach to SFA. The overarching mission of the IAD is to institutionalize SFA capabilities and concepts across DOTMLPF domains within DoD, to capture lessons learned on SFA, and to advocate unity of effort in SFA with other government organizations and with our multinational partners. The IAD would also include divisions for legal review, acquisition/contracting, knowledge management, and exercise support. All permanently assigned personnel, both military and civilian, serving as SMEs within IAD could be deployed as part of SFASTs in support of GCC SFA requirements.

The Joint Center for International Security Force Assistance (JCISFA) is fulfilling part of the role that is envisioned for the IAD. Since its creation in 2006, JCISFA has

worked within DoD to define SFA and integrate SFA concepts and capabilities into Joint Doctrine. The Center has produced multiple publications, established interagency and advisor training center working groups, conducted cadre advisor training across DoD, and initiated research and analysis.²⁵ IAD should absorb JCISFA's current structure and extend the mission throughout the DOTMLPF domains.

- The Doctrine Division would provide guidance for US SFA policy, concept and doctrine integration efforts in coordination with the Joint Staff, Services, and combatant commands. A key enabler to the Doctrine Division would be the SFA lessons-learned collection process conducted by the IAD's Lessons Learned Division (discussed below). The SMEs within the division would evaluate doctrine, identify doctrinal gaps, and work to coordinate comprehensive doctrinal solutions.²⁶ They may be part of an SFAST to help a partner nation create its doctrine or its institutional doctrine-building capability.
- The Organization Division provides SMEs who assist the OAD and GCCs with organizational design recommendations for a partner nation's security forces. It would also assist all force providers in codifying the task force structure of SFA advisory efforts given the changing joint operating environment and doctrine.
- The Training Division, in conjunction with the Services, would lead the development and standardization of joint SFA training capturing the spectrum of conflict from a stable environment to major combat operations. The Training Division would develop training standards, review SFA relevant Universal Joint Task List (UJTL) tasks, and would incorporate lessons learned

into SFA training expediently to ensure deploying individuals, teams, and units have the most current techniques for conducting SFA activities. The division would develop training plans for partner nations, assess SFA training and would provide training assistance to deploying units. The SFA Training Division would have an embedded SFA Training Academy to provide SFA specific courses for the joint force. The academy would conduct an SFA skill competency course which results in the awarding of an SFA joint skill competency identifier. Additionally, the academy would provide SME training to individuals that have been selected to serve as advisors at the operational or ministry levels and who require select training assistance in preparation for deployment. In support of partner nations, the academy would have the capacity to provide SFA training packages, on site course offerings, or course offerings via Mobile Training Teams (MTT). Inherent to all of this training is the vertical alignment of all tactical combat advisor training, operational enabler and support training and strategic staff mentoring training to ensure unity of purpose in execution of SFA activities within the partner nation.

- The Materiel Division would coordinate for materiel support of SFA activities and provide policy and oversight for procurement of supplies and equipment. This division would work closely with the Acquisition/Contracting Division and with the DSCA to obtain the necessary equipment to conduct SFA activities with foreign security forces. The Materiel Division would help identify standard, generic equipment to be acquired under the program for SFA activities.

- The Leader Development/Education Division would help coordinate and promulgate joint SFA professional military education (PME) standards across DoD in coordination with OSD, the joint staff, and the services. The goal is that at each level of professional development, military and civilians are educated on SFA and its application to the current operational environment. This division would develop standards for Tier I and II SFA personnel.
- Personnel Division would work in coordination with the Joint staff, OSD, agencies and Services to assist in developing policy to assess, train, retain and track SMEs in support of SFA. In coordination with the Services and agencies, it would track SFA qualified personnel and assist in identifying qualified SFA personnel to fill GCC mission requirements.²⁷
- The Knowledge Management Division conducts database management and the sharing of critical knowledge throughout the SFA community, while the Lessons Learned Division would reach out to the operational force to capture the most current information, conduct trend analysis, and produce relevant publications.
- The Exercise and Experiment Support Division would participate in selected exercises conducted across the combatant commands and services as a means of providing SFA subject matter expertise to the GCCs. These SMEs can assist GCCs and other organizations in developing the SFA component of exercises.

DSFAA in Action – How It Would Work

A DSFAA core competency is its ability to deploy task-organized teams of SFA subject matter experts in support of GCCs while providing reach back capability to an SFA center of excellence. From steady-state theater security cooperation engagement to the most demanding large-scale SSTR contingencies, the DSFAA provides the GCCs task-organized SFA support through its tiered force structure. The following vignettes illustrate possible DSFAA employment. The vignettes represent an initial response to a GCC steady-state engagement support request, a more extensive preventive partner capacity building effort, and a crisis response to a large-scale SSTR contingency. As presented here, the vignettes build on each other in a cumulative fashion.

Vignette #1 - Initial SFA Engagement Support. A GCC conducts a wide range of TSC exercises and engagement operations across its area of responsibility. To promote increased regional security, the GCC seeks to increase engagement and expand its influence in Country A. In concert with the desires of the US Ambassador and the civilian and military leadership of Country A, the GCC increases its SFA efforts to build security force capacity. The GCC plans to use a pending TSC exercise as a venue to assess Country A's security forces and to build a SFA road map for increasing capacity through future TSC engagement. However, the GCC does not have personnel with the expertise and experience required to evaluate Country A's security forces from the tactical to ministerial level.

After receiving a validated GCC request, the DSFAA task organizes a SFAST based on the specifics of the GCC requirement. The SFAST conducts initial liaison with the GCC TSC exercise planners and provides on-site SME support during the exercise planning process, if required. The SFAST participates in the TSC exercise as part of a

GCC-led observer and controller effort to assess Country A's security forces' effectiveness and capacity. After the exercise, the SFAST provides the GCC with a full-spectrum review, tactical unit to ministerial, of Country A's capability and capacity in relation to stated SFA objectives. The SFAST identifies opportunities to further apply DSFAA expertise in support of the OTERA process, focusing on key operational and ministerial functions requiring improvement to enable further growth in Country A's security forces' capability and capacity.

Vignette #2 - Building FSF Capacity. The GCC, in close coordination with the US Ambassador, requests additional support to increase Country A's security force capacity and effectiveness in response to a deteriorating political crisis in a bordering state. The GCC SFA objective is to build Country A's security force capacity to provide security for its population and secure its borders. The GCC also looks to advance Country A's security forces to a point where they would be able to deploy forces as part of a security alliance or coalition in response to regional security challenges. Basing their requirement on the SFAST assessment, the GCC plans to leverage DSFAA expertise at the operational and ministerial level, while sourcing training and mentoring at the tactical level with organic assets.

After receiving the GCC request, DSFAA assists the Joint Staff in validating the requirement and task organizes an appropriate SFAST to augment the GCC dedicated forces, building on the team that assisted the GCC in conducting the initial assessment in Country A. The SFAST would be reinforced with additional personnel to support a longer duration and expanded mission. If the required personnel are not resident within the DSFAA structure, Tier II and III personnel and/or units would be identified and

requested to address the requirement.²⁸ The SFAST would conduct orientation and pre-deployment training at the DSFAA approved sites, provide additional SFA training to Tier III personnel, then deploy to the GCC as a subordinate element within the overall SFA effort in Country A. Tier I and II personnel may deploy earlier than the Tier III personnel, as we expect that additional training of Tier III units would be required.

The SFAST would partner with operational and ministerial counterparts within Country A's security establishment to provide training, mentorship, and modeling for key leaders and their staffs. The SFAST focuses on developing and increasing ministerial and operational capacity to integrate, coordinate, and support the efforts of their tactical security force units. The SFAST also ties into other GCC general purpose force and SOF trainers at the tactical level as a feedback loop to ensure unity of effort and to measure the effectiveness of the SFA effort.

The DSFAA headquarters continues to play a vital role throughout the SFA mission in Country A. It provides SME reach back support to the SFAST and assists in the synchronization of DoD and interagency actions in support of the GCC SFA effort. Based on equipment and training deficiencies identified by the SFAST, DSFAA would first provide equipment from pre-purchased stocks, and then use 1206 funds to purchase and deliver equipment, munitions, contract trainers, and other essentials to meet remaining immediate requirements to rapidly build initial security force capacity. The DSFAA then acts as a lead coordinator for the GCC to obtain required funding from various authorities, such as FMF, GPOI, PKO, and Counter Drug funds, to enable Country A's security forces to achieve full capability and to ensure long-term support for SFA objectives in Country A.

Vignette #3 – SSTR Response. The GCC conducts crisis planning to address an internal conflict in Country B that threatens to spill over into Country A and destabilize the region. The GCC response options include a GCC-led coalition of regional partners, to include a contingent from Country A (trained and equipped as described in vignette #2), to defeat an aggressor military force and facilitate reestablishment of a functioning government in Country B. The GCC requests DSFAA support during the crisis planning process.

DSFAA task organizes and deploys SFASTs to support GCC crisis planning. One SFAST may assist the GCC in improving country A's forces to conduct FID and support the coalition, and then to conduct combat advising for those forces. Another SFAST focuses on Phase IV and V planning, where the GCC expects to assume the responsibility for rebuilding or creating military and police forces within Country B after MCO. To support this effort, the second SFAST, reinforced with Tier II and III personnel as required, deploys with lead GCC forces to conduct an initial SFA assessment of Country B's security forces. This tactical to ministerial SFA review would provide the GCC with a starting point for the OTERA tasks to be undertaken for the security forces of Country B. The SFAST also acts in concert with a DoS-led Advance Civilian Team (ACT) deployed to the region²⁹ to ensure unity of effort of SFA activities in support of GCC objectives during the vital early stages of stability operations.

Based on the requirements of the GCC SFA plan, the SFAST initially fills key billets and advisor/trainer support functions of Country B, and provides training and mentorship to key leaders and their staffs of Country B's security forces. Depending on the scope of the SFA operation, DSFAA would coordinate with the Services and

agencies to provide additional trained Tier II and III personnel to support the effort in Country B.³⁰ Upon GCC request, the DSFAA could also provide the core of a Joint SFA Support Task Force (JSFASTF) headquarters to command, control, and synchronize all SFA activities in Country B.³¹ The JSFASTF would coordinate OTERA for all levels and functions of Country B's security forces. This vertical integration with Country B's security forces would enable the JSFASTF to quickly validate or establish the link between the nation's political leadership from the ministerial level to tactical units, and ensure all of the institutional support organizations of the security forces are organized and trained to support the common aims.

The JSFASTF would remain in place until Country B's security force capability and capacity increased to the level where it was able to protect its population and secure its external borders. As Country B's security forces capabilities and capacities increase, JSFASTF elements are replaced by qualified follow-on forces or S/CRS personnel, and redeployed until only an SFAST remains to provide the GCC a final full-spectrum review of Country B's security forces and recommends a strategy for future steady-state TSC engagement.

Conclusion – Reduce The Ad Hocery

Secretary of Defense Gates has made it clear that in order to protect US national interests abroad, US forces must retain an immediate and long-term core capacity to build partner capacity.³² The US military has learned many lessons in the recent conflicts concerning SFA, to include advising partner nations from the tactical through ministerial levels. It would be a mistake to squander this experience,

To avoid significant failings inherent in an ad hoc approach there is need for a holistic approach to SFA. DoD needs a standing organization that can leverage US military and civilian expertise internally as well as externally across the interagency and our international partners. The organization we propose, the Defense Security Force Assistance Agency, would provide the instrument for horizontal and vertical coordination within and across DoD as well as with the interagency, given some realignment of roles and authorities within DoD, and between DoD and DoS. Likewise, it would provide both horizontal and vertical operational and institutional support to partner nations, a framework that would be mirrored within the organization to effectively coordinate SFA across the DOTMLPF domains. DSFAA would provide readily deployable Tier I and Tier II support to the GCCs and partner nations, and would have the capability to generate Tier III capacity by assisting in coordinating augmentation from Special Operations and General Purpose Forces. Finally, the organization would provide a repository of legal and budgetary expertise to source, fund, and manage monies from various complex authorities that play a role in the SFA arena.

The intent of this proposal is to provide an organizational solution that effectively concentrates advocacy and expertise for SFA to better facilitate GCC conduct of SFA missions. The agency would function along institutional lines, developing the required range of DOTMLPF capabilities to develop effective security force assistance plans while leveraging available DoD and US governmental assets. The agency would also help accomplish SFA missions by providing core expertise to US forces committed to SFA operations in support of the GCCs and US Ambassadors. The end result is to build

enduring partner capacity and capability, favorably shape the international environment, and protect US national interests abroad.

Endnotes

¹ Robert Gates, "A Balanced Strategy" *Foreign Affairs*, 88, no. 1 (January/February 2009): 29-30.

² U.S. Department of Defense, *Draft Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI): Security Force Assistance* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, February 25, 2009), 12.

³ Ibid., 11. The DODI introduced and defined OTERA as follows:

Organize: to develop and implement appropriate force structures and support elements that will allow foreign security forces to accomplish their purpose

Train: to teach, in a controlled environment, individuals or units the skills necessary to accomplish their assigned missions. This entails the acquisition of knowledge, skills, and competencies at all levels from the individual through units of various sizes and institutions to the highest levels of the security ministries.

Equip: to give, sell, or finance the acquisition of systems that are appropriate to the missions of the partner security forces and are sustainable in the long run.

Rebuild: to construct security institutions and units, and the physical infrastructure they require. Residual structure may be adequate to provide a foundation for reformed structure, but it may be necessary to dismantle old structures and essentially build from the ground up.

Advise: to counsel and mentor individuals and units undergoing training or conducting operations, at the tactical through ministerial level as necessary. When authorized by law, US forces may partner with foreign security force units and/or embed advisors with those units, in both combat and peacetime operations, in order to bolster the ability of partner security forces to accomplish their assigned mission by providing equipment, materiel, logistics, or other military support.

⁴ Robert Gates, *National Defense Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: The Pentagon: June 2008), 9.

⁵ Richard B. Myers, *National Military Strategy of the United States of America* (Washington, DC: The Pentagon: 2004), 11.

⁶ Dennis C. Blair, "Annual Threat Assessment of the Intelligence Community for the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence," *Congressional Report* (February 12, 2009) 2. According to Blair, "The Primary near-term security concern of the United States is the global economic crisis and its geopolitical implications....Roughly a quarter of the countries in the world have already experienced low-level instability such as government changes because of the current slowdown...Statistical modeling shows that economic crises increase the risk of regime-threatening instability if they persist over a one to two year period. Besides increased economic

nationalism, the most likely political fallout for US interests will involve allies and friends not being able to fully meet their defense and humanitarian obligations.”

⁷ U.S. Department of Defense. *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations version 3.0* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, January 15, 2009), 26.

⁸Ibid., 26.

⁹ Similar ad hoc approaches to SFA were common during the war in Vietnam. For a particularly good account, see Andrew Krepinevich, *The Army and Vietnam* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

¹⁰David H. Gurney. “An Interview with George W. Casey, Jr.,” *Joint Force Quarterly* 52 (2009): 18. General Casey is quoted as saying, “So we’re looking more toward the majority of this work being done by Special Forces, augmented, when they need to be, by regionally oriented conventional forces, which is something else the ARFORGEN model allows us to do. We also asked ourselves if we really think we’re going to build another country’s army and police forces and ministries from the ground up any time soon. And the answer was, probably not. We’ve got several challenges: we’ve got to set ourselves up to do Iraq and Afghanistan for the long haul, and then figure out how we augment Special Forces to do the other engagement that we need. That’s kind of the direction we’re going. In the interim, we have a training center for transition teams that we’re going to continue to run, it’s going to move down to Fort Polk, out of Fort Riley, and we’re going to have a brigade dedicated to doing nothing but training transition teams. So we’ll continue to do that for a while.”

¹¹ U.S. Department of Defense, *Draft Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI): Security Force Assistance*, 12.

¹²U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), “Security Forces Assistance,” draft predecisional working paper, November 2008, 9.

¹³ Dave Maxwell, “Considerations for Organizing and Preparing for Security Force Assistance Operations,” *Small War Journal*, March 28, 2008, <http://smallwarsjournal.com/mag/docs-temp/45-maxwell.pdf> (accessed January 3, 2009).

¹⁴Daniel S. Roper, “Global Insurgency: Strategic Clarity for the Long War,” *Parameters* 38, no. 3 (Autumn 2008): 105.

¹⁵ U.S. Department of Defense, *Determining the Roles for General Purpose Forces (GPF) and Special Operations Forces (SOF) in Security Force Assistance (SFA) Missions and Refining a Process for Identifying the Best Force for Specific SFA Missions* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, May 23, 2008), 3.

¹⁶ The following matrix provides a brief analysis of comparative criteria for the potential organizational placement of overall SFA activities responsibility. Below the matrix is a list of pros and cons related to the various organizational placements.

The analysis reflects the consideration of lead responsibility for SFA activities in a unified combatant command (geographic or functional), within a military department (Service), in DSCA, and within a separate defense agency (DSFAA).

Placement Criteria \	Combatant Command	Service as Executive Agency	DSCA	DSFAA
Comprehensiveness	-	-	-	+
Authority	-	-	+	+
Existing Assets	+	+	+	-
Demonstrated Acceptability	+	-	-	-
Location	-	+	+	+

Criteria description:

Comprehensiveness/strategic focus—Suitability of the placement to integrating SFA across all levels, with particular emphasis on the strategic level (ministerial, Service headquarters level) that has proven most challenging.

Authority—Placement within the DoD hierarchy that is likely to govern implementation and performance across the department.

Existing Assets/Resources—Existing Facilities, institutional assets, budget.

Demonstrated acceptability—Evidence of existing acceptance by other major stakeholders.

Location—Likely value of organizational headquarters location to integration of SFA activities.

Premium on facilitating overarching command of DoD participation and coordination with interagency and multinational partners. Washington DC-based preferred.

Combatant Command

PROs:

- Assigned forces available
- Large joint staff structure
- Generally accepted as lead for all operational missions, to include SFA (demonstrated acceptability)
- (GCC) Clear responsibility for specific regions and established relationships with states in the region
- (FCC) Force provider for specialized forces (SOCOM, TRANSCOM, STRATCOM) and for unassigned general purpose forces (JFCOM)
- (JFCOM) Experimentation and development expertise/responsibility
- (JFCOM) Standing Joint Task Force HQ core element (?) links
- (SOCOM) Current source of SFA expertise.
- (SOCOM) Excellent tactical experience and expertise.
- (SOCOM) Good training base (facilities, limited school houses) especially at Army component level (SF, USASOC)

CONS:

- Narrows responsibility and makes it easier for services to avoid responsibility
- SFA solutions likely to be command specific and difficult to generalize more broadly.
- Lack of authority over other COCOMs and services (especially regarding DOTMLPF).
- Limited interagency links.
- (GCC) Demonstrated inadequacy in executing large-scale SFA operations (this has been our typical approach, and it has been part of the reason the Department as a whole has not done this more comprehensively)

- Operational, tactical focus
- Headquarters not based in DC

Military Service as Executive Agent

PROs:

- Access and authority over resources
- Extensive DOTMLPF integration experience and capabilities
- Large organizations
- DC-based headquarters

CONs:

- Lack of operational responsibility
- Limited interagency links.
- Lack of authority over GCCs or other services

An element of DSCA with expanded roles and mission

PROs:

- Already responsible for administering some authorities for SFA activities
- Existing organizational structure which can be used for SFA management with established links to the MilDeps, GCCs and country teams (SAOs) and State Department.
- Procedures in place for obtaining and providing defense articles, services and training via the MilDeps
- Executive agency for regional centers and various senior level (ministerial, service level) foreign education programs
- DC-based headquarters

CONs:

- Long standing focus on security assistance in terms of management/administration that has generally defined the organization and its habits
- No operational capacity, experience.
- Majority of manning is funded via FMS administrative fees, not O&M
- Lacks authorities over MilDeps to deploy troops to conduct training (vice contractors)
- Does not normally provide assistance during combat operations
- Lacks capability to fully integrate training from tactical to ministerial level on a comprehensive basis

A new DoD Agency -- DSFAA

PROs:

- Comprehensiveness/Unity of effort—born joint
- Authority remains at highest levels of DoD leadership: Allows it to leverage strengths of geographic and functional combatant commands and JFCOM and link them to overarching DoD effort
- DC-Based—ease of links to interagency and many potential multi-national participants

CONs:

- New idea (difficulties in creating new organization, especially manning)

- Likely resistance from existing stakeholders that would become at least partial bill payers for creating new organization
- Starting from scratch for resources
- Potential for services/GCCs to ignore if not adequately empowered and resourced

¹⁷ We recommend this placement given the need for a close working relationship with DSCA, which is also organized under ASD(GSA). The placement within OUSD(P) also facilitates close coordination with ASD SO/LIC, the higher headquarters for USSOCOM.

¹⁸ U.S. Department of Defense, *Determining the Roles for General Purpose Forces (GPF) and Special Operations Forces (SOF) in Security Force Assistance (SFA) Missions and Refining a Process for Identifying the Best Force for Specific SFA Missions*, 3.

¹⁹ Section 1206 of the *FY2006 National Defense Authorization Act*, Public Law 109-163 (January 6, 2006), as amended, provides the Secretary of Defense with a new authority to train and equip foreign military forces and foreign maritime security forces. Authority has been extended until FY2011. Up to \$350M of DoD O&M funds authorized for FY09. Prior to 1206 authority, DoD generally trained and equipped foreign military forces utilizing State Department security assistance programs. However, according to DoD, "traditional security assistance takes three to four years from concept to execution." Global Train and Equip authority allows a response to emergent threats or opportunities in six months or less. U.S. Department of Defense, *Fiscal Year 2009 Budget Request Summary Justification* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, February 4, 2008), 103.

²⁰ *International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981*, Public Law 97-113, Section 108 a (December 29, 1981). Established Chapter 5 to the Arms Export Control Act for the Special Defense Acquisition Fund for the procurement of Defense articles and in anticipation of selling or transferring them to foreign customers. The Fund operated as a revolving fund and was capitalized with revenues from U.S. Government sales and contractors' export sales. It was repealed by Section 2795 of Public Law 104-164 (July 21, 1996).

²¹ We believe there are redundancies in SFA support throughout the DoD that can be reduced to provide a minimal growth solution.

²² A myriad of LNOs from other agencies is envisioned, with perhaps the most critical case being that of the State Department (with ties to country teams, the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, USAID, Foreign Military Sales, the Global Train and Equip Program, Partners for Peace, etc). Other LNO positions would potentially be established with Law Enforcement agencies, Customs and Immigration, Commerce, etc)

²³ Multi-National Security Transition Command - Iraq and NATO Training Mission - Iraq, "MNSTC-I Organizational Structure", http://www.mnstci.iraq.centcom.mil/mnstci_mission.aspx (accessed 18 January, 2009).

²⁴ U.S. Department of State, "About S/CRS – Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization," <http://www.state.gov/s/crs/c12936.htm> (accessed February 20, 2009).

²⁵ "Joint Center for International Security Force Assistance Organization Brief," July 18, 2008, <https://jcsifsa.jcs.mil/> (accessed January 16, 2009).

²⁶ Joint Center for International Security Force Assistance, "SFA Milestones," briefing slides with scripted commentary, Fort Leavenworth, KS, Joint Center for International Security Force Assistance, 2008.

²⁷ U.S. Department of Defense, *Department of Defense Strategic Plan for Joint Officer Management and Joint Professional Military Education* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense, April 3, 2006), 4.

²⁸ Sourcing for units as part of Tier III expansion would take place via the normal global force management process.

²⁹ U.S. Department of the Army, *Stability Operations*, Field Manual 3-07 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Army, October 2008), B-3. An advance civilian team (ACT) is one element of the larger Civilian Response Corps (CRC) initiative from the S/CRS. S/CRS envisions the CRC as consisting of an active group of personnel readily available for deployment, a standby list of additional personnel throughout the government capable of deployment on short notice, and a list of reserve personnel who could be activated and prepared for deployment within a few months.

³⁰ The DSFAA provides pre-deployment SME training to deploying units designated to conduct SFA operations in Country B. The DSFAA task organizes mobile train teams (MTT) to conduct the pre-deployment SFA training on-site and deploys the MTT with the unit as SFA mentors and liaison officers once in Country B.

³¹ This concept would represent a more coherent approach to the process that ultimately generated the security force assistance headquarters in Afghanistan (CSTC-A, Combined Security Transition Command-Afghanistan) and Iraq (MNSTC-I, Multinational Security Transition Command-Iraq).

³² In addition to his Foreign Affairs article ("A Balanced Strategy"), Secretary Gates has emphasized this point in numerous other public statements to include his Landon Lecture at Kansas State University, November 26, 2007, <http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1199> (accessed January 20, 2009).