

**Report to Congress**  
**Section 1206(f) of the 2006 National Defense Authorization Act**

**Introduction**

Section 1206(f) of the National Defense Authorization Act, 2006 (NDAA), calls for the President to submit a report examining the issues highlighted below:

- “The strengths and weaknesses of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Arms Export Control Act, and any other provision of law related to building the capacity of foreign governments or the training and equipping of foreign military forces,” including strengths and weaknesses for the purposes of conducting counterterrorist operations or participating or supporting stability operations.
- “The changes, if any, that should be made to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, the Arms Export Control Act, and any other relevant provision of law that would improve the ability of the United States Government to build the capacity of foreign governments or train and equip foreign military forces,” including for the purposes of conducting counterterrorist operations or participating or supporting stability operations.
- “The organizational and procedural changes, if any, that should be made in the Departments of State and Defense to improve their ability to conduct programs to build the capacity of foreign governments or train and equip foreign military forces,” including for the purposes of conducting counterterrorist operations or participating or supporting stability operations.
- “The resources and funding mechanisms required to assure adequate funding for such programs.”

The President’s authority to provide this report has been delegated to the Secretary of State. The following report, which has been prepared with input from the Department of Defense, addresses only a portion of the entire realm of foreign assistance for which the Secretary of State is primarily responsible that relates to assistance to train and equip foreign security forces.

Security cooperation remains a critical foreign policy tool that allows the United States to advance its national security interests worldwide, from continuing partnerships with our allies to promoting key American values with respect to

democracy, human rights, and civilian rule of the military. Building partner nation security capacity is one of the most important strategic requirements for the United States to promote international security, advance U.S. interests and prevail in the war against terrorism, and meet other national security challenges. Adversaries like Al Qaeda confront the United States and our allies with terror and other asymmetric means. We know they have the ability to operate within the borders of nations friendly to the United States and likely will not be overcome by the direct application of U.S. military force alone. Too often, such adversaries and their nation-state supporters can quickly and effectively propagate terror and stage political, social, and economic campaigns.

Effective partners are key to disrupting terrorist networks and other transnational threats around the globe, thereby preventing crises that would require the deployment of U.S. forces. Security cooperation increases the capacity of U.S. military forces by providing necessary funding and training to coalition partners and friendly nations, thus enabling those nations to work towards common security goals, share burdens in joint missions, manage ungoverned spaces and external threats, and address security issues without direct U.S. involvement.

Our longstanding security assistance, its authorities, and resources should be supplemented to be capable of meeting today's U.S. strategic requirements. Existing Department of State authorities include the Foreign Military Financing (FMF), International Military Education and Training (IMET), and Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) accounts authorized by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (FAA), and the Arms Export Control Act (AECA). While this kind of assistance is critical, new tools are required in today's security environment. Select new authorities form the basis of closer cooperation between the Department of State and the Department of Defense. Among these is Section 1206 of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), 2006, as amended, that has the potential, if sufficiently resourced, to enhance implementation of assistance programs worldwide. These authorities augment the existing tools available to both Secretaries to respond to opportunities or unforeseen challenges that make the initiation or expansion of a training, equipping, or advisory program necessary. To be clear: maintaining the status quo with respect to security assistance tools – particularly resources – will not meet the requirements of today's security environment or strain on U.S. forces.

## SECTION I

### **Strengths and Weaknesses of the Existing Legislation:**

#### *Strengths*

Over the last fifteen years, the United States has faced a string of complex and often unexpected challenges from Afghanistan to Haiti, and from Lebanon to Sudan. Improving our whole-of-government response to crises and emerging threats and our ability to take advantage of unexpected opportunities has been our first priority. It has yielded some impressive results.

Among the most welcome developments has been Congressional support for reconstruction and stabilization efforts such as the State Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, Section 1207 of the FY 2006 NDAA, and recent Congressional support for reconstruction and stabilization authorities and resources, including for a Civilian Reserve Corps.

Current legislation provides the basic framework for effective foreign assistance aimed at building the capacity of foreign governments and the training and equipping of foreign military forces. However, this assistance, its authorities, and resources has not kept up with the current U.S. strategic need. The oversight provided by the current system minimizes the potential for misuse of the assistance, including accountability for the transfer of U.S.-origin equipment. The existing Foreign Military Sales process requires that host nations “buy-in” for purchases of defense articles and services – an essential element to ensure that the equipment and training is sustainable by the host nation and is not the continuing responsibility of the United States to fund. Foreign recipients view our system as one that allows little or no room for corruption within their own countries.

Specifically, the strengths of certain key specific authorities relating to the training and equipping of foreign military forces may be summarized as follows:

#### Under the Arms Export Control Act (AECA):

- Foreign Military Financing (FMF) – authorizes grants, credits or loans, and loan guarantees, all of which may be implemented in a highly flexible manner, but are hampered by specific earmarks and insufficient funding that too often limit that flexibility.

- Cooperative research, development, and production – authorizes cooperative research, development, and production of defense articles and services, permitting some of the most creative security cooperation with our allies. Section 27 of the AECA provides the most expansive of these authorities, as it permits cooperative production (e.g., Joint Strike Fighter (JSF)).

Under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (FAA):

- International Military Education and Training (IMET) – authorizes military education and training of both foreign government military and civilian personnel, a system that has been effectively implemented. However, because IMET programs must be conducted primarily by bringing recipients to the United States, there is a need for complementary programs that can educate or train partners quickly and effectively in-theater or in host nations.
- Peacekeeping Operations (PKO) – although not a military assistance authority per se, it authorizes assistance for voluntarily funded peacekeeping and other programs in the national security interest of the United States, and hence can be used liberally to train and equip foreign militaries.
- Drawdowns – diverse drawdowns under the FAA, specifically sections 506 and 552, can be used to train and equip military forces, drawing on the resources of other U.S. Government agencies, when recommended by the Secretary of State to the President.
- Excess defense article authorities – the FAA authorizes the provision of excess defense articles as foreign assistance.
- Nonproliferation and Export Control – Nonproliferation authority that supports programs to prevent proliferation of WMD, including training of border guards. FAA §581 et seq.
- Anti-Terrorism Assistance – Although not military in nature, this is a complementary authority to enhance the ability of foreign law enforcement forces to combat terrorism. FAA §571 et seq.
- International Organizations and programs – FAA section 301, particularly as it relates to voluntary contributions to support IAEA nonproliferation programs.

- International Counternarcotics – §481 et seq., insofar as it has been used to provide assistance to military forces engaged in counternarcotics efforts.
- Other – Complementary authorities, such as those found in §607 of the FAA, permit sales of commodities and services for peacekeeping uses, among other things, and emergency waiver authorities in the FAA permit overcoming certain legislative restrictions.

Although beyond the scope of the reporting requirement, we would note that the very useful authorities cited above have long been supplemented by select Department of Defense authorities, including:

- Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement (ACSA) [10 U.S.C. §§2341 – 2350; also temporary authority under FY 2007 NDAA §1202]
- Combatant Commander Initiative Fund [10 U.S.C. §166(a)]
- Cooperative Research, Development, Test and Evaluation and Production [10 U.S.C. §§ 2350(a), 2358]
- Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid [10 U.S.C. §2561]
- Humanitarian Civic Assistance and Humanitarian Mine Action [10 U.S.C. §§401 and 407]
- Joint Combined Exchange Training (JCET) [10 U.S.C. § 2011]
- Regional Centers for Security Studies [10 U.S.C. §§ 184. Also see FY 2007 NDAA §904]
- Regional Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP) [10 U.S.C. §2249(c); FY 2007 NDAA §1204]
- Warsaw Initiative Funds Supporting Partnership for Peace Programs [10 U.S.C. §§ 168, 1051, 2021]
- Afghanistan Security Forces Fund [FY 2007 NDAA §1517]
- Commanders' Emergency Response Program [FY 2006 NDAA §1202]

- DoD Counter Drug Program [FY 1991 NDAA, §1004]
- Iraq Freedom Fund [FY 2007 NDAA §1515]
- Iraq Security Forces Fund [FY 2007 NDAA §1516]
- Logistic Support for Allied Forces [FY 2007 NDAA §1201]
- Section 1206 Train and Equip [FY 2007 NDAA §1206]
- Section 1207 Support for Civilian Stabilization and Reconstruction [FY 2006 NDAA §1207]
- Section 1208 Special Operations Forces authority [FY 2005 NDAA Section 1208]

### *Weaknesses*

As previously noted, current legislation allows us to address many issues with respect to training and equipping foreign militaries. However, this assistance has not kept up with the current U.S. strategic need. This weakens the U.S. ability to enable partners to take on the task of defeating terrorist threats, promoting international security, and advancing U.S. interests, thereby increasing the strain on U.S. forces and endangering our servicemen and women. The ability to flexibly adapt to new strategic challenges has been affected by additional legislation that too often has as its sole purpose to impose restrictions and limitations. The complex mix of legislation, mainly sanctions legislation that restricts foreign assistance outside of the basic FAA and AECA authorities, impose unhelpful constraints on the President's flexibility; many of these sanctions should be repealed. Annual appropriations also contain yearly congressional earmarks that limit our ability to put funding towards critical priorities, emerging threats, or new opportunities. In this era, we need, at a minimum, to preserve flexibility in order to help us to deal with a rapidly changing strategic and tactical environment and an adaptive set of enemies. To maximize flexibility and efficiency, the period of availability of single-year security-related appropriations funds for foreign assistance could usefully be expanded to multi-year periods – as is employed for non-security assistance accounts.

Today's threats need more flexible responses and require us to engage with a range of foreign security forces, some not under the traditional military structure. We have recognized this new dynamic by providing some FMF-funded defense articles to counterterrorism entities where the country's national structure places responsibility for counterterrorism activities in a ministry other than the Ministry of Defense, but only when the purposes of the assistance is to counter a terrorist threat. We could benefit from enhanced authority to provide assistance of this sort, including the ability to train civil gendarmes to supplement international peacekeeping missions (e.g., the Global Peace Operations Initiative) and provide training to counterterrorism units.

### **Shared Congressional and Executive Branch Interests:**

#### ***Funding***

The Congress has recognized the urgency of targeted contingency tools, particularly emergency accounts, typically in supplemental appropriations legislation designed specifically to respond to urgent crises. Since 9/11, Congress, working closely with the Administration, has provided substantial resources in, among others, the Emergency Response Fund (ERF); several emergency accounts in the first and second Iraq and Afghanistan supplemental appropriations acts, including: Iraq Freedom Fund, the Coalition Support Fund, and the Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP); and separate funds first designed to train and equip Afghan and Iraqi military and now expanded to all security forces of both countries, the Iraq Security Forces Fund and the Afghanistan Security Forces Fund. On the reconstruction side, these supplemental appropriations acts have provided the Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF) and a similar Tsunami relief and reconstruction fund.

#### ***Oversight and Reporting Requirements***

The Administration respects the oversight role of the Congress and is sensitive to the imperative to provide, on an ongoing basis, transparent and detailed information to enable Congress and the Administration to act as partners in efforts to address national security issues. Notification and reporting requirements, as well as the offer of briefings, are used to provide Congress with clear and comprehensive information needed to legislate judiciously. These tools of oversight should be reviewed to ensure timely action that is reflective of today's security environment. We seek to reduce unnecessary and often obsolete reporting requirements that were in many cases designed to address issues that have long

since been resolved or that otherwise may have passed their original sunset provisions. Our primary goal is to ensure transparent and complete disclosure to Congress while effectively addressing emergent threats or opportunities.

## SECTION II

### **Changes to Existing Legislation:**

As Secretary Rice has articulated, United States security is linked to the capacity of foreign states to govern justly and effectively, invest in and improve the lives of their people, create the conditions for economic growth and development, and conduct themselves responsibly within the international system. Foreign assistance is an essential component of achieving those aims. In order to transform our capabilities to use foreign assistance to meet our current and long-term challenges, the Secretary has, as discussed further below, established the Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance to serve as an umbrella leadership structure for aligning and coordinating all foreign assistance policy, planning, and oversight and to maximize and account for foreign assistance resources.

The Departments of State and Defense have from time to time proposed new legislation that would supplement existing legislation to help improve the ability of the U.S. Government to train, equip, and build the capacity of foreign governments to assist in the war on terrorism, to respond to humanitarian crises, or to participate in peacekeeping and coalition operations. Some of those proposals that have fully cleared the interagency process, including the Office of Management and Budget, follow:

### ***Supplement or revise the FAA and AECA***

In March 2005, the State Department included a chapter in its proposed foreign relations authorization bill for FY 2006-2007 that included extensive targeted amendments aimed at updating and making even more flexible existing foreign assistance authorizations found in the FAA and the AECA – many of which were included by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in S. 600. These included essential increases in thresholds for Congressional notifications for arms sales and defense exports, expanded waiver and comparable authorities, and consolidated reporting requirements. Particularly relevant proposals are noted below, along with some that have since been proposed by the Administration:



- **Non-MoD Forces:** To clarify that it has only been a matter of policy practice and stress that military assistance may be made available for purposes of the AECA, which include maintaining internal security and countering terrorist forces, it has been proposed that the purposes of military assistance be clarified to include anti-terrorism (and nonproliferation) purposes. This would simply reaffirm that FMF may be used, like military assistance authorized under section 502 of the FAA, for anti-terrorism purposes, regardless of whether the foreign governmental force is organized under a defense or civilian ministry of that country. This amendment was made to the FAA to clarify that such purposes are included in those for which military assistance may be provided. However, at the time of that amendment, a parallel change was not made to the AECA. To provide greater flexibility to peacekeeping operations authorities to support counterterrorism activities when performed by civilian law enforcement units, the State Department has requested on several occasions that a “notwithstanding” authority be added to that authorization and also that the ban on assistance for civilian law enforcement units, in section 660 of the FAA, be repealed or amended with regard to peacekeeping operations (PKO) funds. This is particularly important in view of the availability of national police force gendarme units in many nations that could be trained to supplement military peacekeepers in peace support operations.
- **Section 506 Drawdown Authority:** Drawdown authority of section 506 of the FAA needs to be amended, at a minimum, to: 1) increase the annual drawdown limit; 2) expand the purposes for drawdown to include training and equipping foreign military and security forces to disrupt or destroy terrorist networks, close safe havens, or participate in or support U.S., coalition, or international military or stability operations, and to permit reconstruction and stabilization assistance; and 3) allow the Department of Defense to drawdown funds to procure new defense articles and services (i.e., not limited only to Defense stocks). These changes would enhance the utility of the drawdown authority, which has diminished over time due to the “just in time” acquisition policy that resulted in the virtual elimination of stocks.
- **Thresholds for Congressional Notification of FMF and Licensed Exports:** In the March 2005 proposed bill, the Administration requested substantial increases to the arms sales and exports notifications thresholds, from \$50M to \$100M and \$14M to \$50M for defense articles, and from \$200M to \$350M for defense services. The FY 2003 Foreign Relations

Authorization Act increased modestly the thresholds for Congressional notification of FMS and licensed transfers to NATO countries, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand from \$14M to \$25M for Major Defense Equipment (MDE) and from \$50M to \$100M for other defense articles and services. While welcome, these increased thresholds still do not reflect the increased costs of modern military equipment. Moreover, these increased thresholds are not applicable to transfers to many of our key coalition partners in the war on terrorism.

- **Waiver Authorities:** Request an amendment to State Department extraordinary waiver authorities in FAA section 614 and 451, including increases in the latter.
- **Establishment of a Defense Coalition Support Account:** Authorize the President to establish a Defense Coalition Support Account to better support coalition partners. This proposal would build upon aspects of the Special Defense Acquisition Fund (SDAF) and on some aspects of the Defense Cooperation Account. The proposed revision to existing SDAF legislation would allow the Department of Defense to pre-purchase equipment for sale or temporary use, with concurrence of the Secretary of State, to its coalition partners, using funds that have been made available to Defense through appropriations by the Congress or by using donations from non-U.S. Government sources.

### *Supplemental Relevant Defense Authorities*

- **Section 1206 Authorization Level:** Amend Section 1206 of the FY 2007 NDAA to increase the funding authorization level from \$300M to \$750M, to allow assistance to non-military security forces; to eliminate the sunset clause; to enable training of forces to participate in or support military and stability operations that are consistent with the security interests of the United States; and to build the capacity of security forces in a country when U.S. forces are deployed in large-scale stability operations in that country. While the existing section 1206 authority allows training of military forces essential to ongoing counterterrorism or stability operations, its effectiveness would be enhanced with the proposed modifications that take into account the significant financial requirements and the command structure of foreign forces (note: relevant forces are not always under military command). The proposed change would remove the provisions that incorporated restrictions from the FAA or foreign operations appropriations acts. Finally, the

proposal would allow a waiver of restrictions by the President or the Secretary of State under existing waiver authorities or upon determining that it is in the national security interests of the United States to do so. These proposed changes would increase the U.S. Government's ability to meet time-sensitive requirements to build the capacity of foreign security forces for counterterrorism operations or stability operations.

- **Significant Military Equipment:** Authorize the Secretary of Defense, with Secretary of State concurrence, to transfer under the authority of an Acquisition and Cross Servicing Agreement (ACSA), on a lease or loan basis, items identified as Significant Military Equipment for personnel protection or to aid in personnel survivability to nations participating with U.S. Armed Forces in all military operations (not just Iraq and Afghanistan) if the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, determines in writing that it is in the national security interests of the United States to provide such support.
- **Education and Training:** Make permanent, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the authority of the Secretary of Defense to expend operations and maintenance funds to provide electronically-distributed learning content and related information technology for the education and training of foreign military and civilian government personnel to enhance interoperability during multinational operations. Providing this type of training allows our foreign partners to develop capabilities in a manner that will ensure interoperability with U.S. forces on the battlefield.
- **Centers of Excellence:** Make permanent, and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the authority which authorized the Secretary of Defense to enter into agreements with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) alliance members, major non-NATO allies, and other friendly foreign countries to participate in organizations that are Centers of Excellence (COE), established to enhance interoperability, develop military doctrine, and develop and test new concepts. The proposal would increase the authorization for expenditures for the U.S. share of operating expenses from \$3M to \$5M. The United States benefits from this participation through its ability to influence the commonality of doctrine, education, training, and development of new capabilities. This process improves interoperability between U.S. and foreign militaries and enhances security cooperation efforts to prosecute the War on Terror. Strengthening our relationships through participation in organization supportive

transformational concepts also strengthens the current transformational efforts of the Department of Defense.

- **Section 1208 Support to Foreign Forces:** Make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the relevant Chief of Mission, to expend up to \$25,000,000 during any fiscal year to provide support to foreign forces, irregular forces, groups, or individuals engaged in supporting or facilitating ongoing military operations by United States special operations forces to combat terrorism. The activities authorized under Section 1208 of the FY 2005 NDAA have proven to be an invaluable tool for Special Operations Forces in the fight against international terrorism. The current authority will expire at the end of FY 2007.
- **Geographic Combatant Commander's Authority to Transfer Excess Defense Articles:** Authorize Geographic Combatant Commanders, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to transfer on a grant basis, a total of \$25,000 per year of non-lethal excess defense articles to each country within that commander's area of responsibility for the purpose of building the capacity of such countries to conduct counterterrorist operations, or to participate in or support military and stability operations in which the United States armed forces are a participant.
- **Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA):** Amend Section 2561(a)(1) of Title 10, United States Code, by inserting "and, with the concurrence of the relevant Chief of Mission, for stabilization purposes" after "other humanitarian purposes." Overseas Humanitarian, Disaster, and Civic Aid (OHDACA) provides the Department of Defense with a unique capability that enables DoD commanders to access countries and regions that would otherwise be inaccessible to U.S. forces. Unlike the Commanders' Emergency Response Program, OHDACA can be used for planned programmed activities, making it a key shaping tool. Using OHDACA, commanders have a non-combat, results-oriented tool to interact with governments, indigenous organizations, and ordinary citizens to establish long-term, positive relationships, mitigating terrorist influence, and preventing conflict.
- **DoD Rewards Program:** Amend Section 127b(a) of Title 10, United States Code to allow payment of rewards, with the concurrence of the relevant Chief of Mission, for information or non-lethal assistance provided to the government personnel of coalition nations and nations in which the U.S.

Armed Forces are stationed or operating. The amendment would also expand the purpose for which rewards may be given to include assistance that benefits the force protection for coalition forces or forces of a country in which the U.S. Armed Forces are operating. This authority is useful to encourage the local citizens of foreign countries to provide information and other assistance, including the delivery of dangerous personnel and weapons to U.S. military authorities. Extending it to encourage the provision of information to our partners, to enhance their force protection, provides a key vehicle to improve U.S. and partner nation personnel survivability and improve the United States' ability to sustain partners that deploy alongside U.S. Armed Forces.

- **Commanders Emergency Response Program (CERP):** Make permanent the CERP and extend the authority beyond Iraq and Afghanistan. This authority would allow the Secretary of Defense to authorize U.S. military commanders to use Department of Defense funds appropriated to the CERP or other operations and maintenance funds for urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction assistance to local populations where U.S. forces are operating. Resources under this section would be available for all military and security operations, including humanitarian, civic assistance, disaster relief, and peace operations. The Departments of Defense and State shall jointly develop procedures for the exercise of this authority. Such procedures shall provide for expeditious coordination between the Department of Defense and the Department of State to achieve agile, appropriate, and effective use of this authority to promote the security interests of the United States.

### SECTION III

#### **Organizational and Procedural Changes:**

The Administration does not seek legislated changes in isolation. Many changes were also required within the Executive Branch. Several major initiatives are underway to reform processes in the Executive Branch to improve our ability to carry out foreign assistance activities and programs, such as train and equip programs.

The Department of State has:

- Created the Office of the Director of Foreign Assistance. The Office is responsible for ensuring that all U.S. foreign assistance is driven by a coherent framework and is accountable, transparent, and consistent with country-specific foreign policy goals.
  - The State Department is continuing foreign assistance reform with implementation of the FY 2007 foreign assistance budget and operational planning and development of a strategic FY 2008 budget.
- Created the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) to strengthen U.S. institutional capacity to respond to crises involving failing, failed, and post-conflict states and complex emergencies. The Coordinator was recently dual-hatted as a Deputy Director in the Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance, as part of an alignment of S/CRS' operational expertise and planning mandate with the funding authorities and budget processes of the Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance.
- Defined a single overarching goal "transformational diplomacy" (*to help build and sustain democratic well-governed states that respond to the needs of their people, reduce widespread poverty, and conduct themselves responsibly in the international system*) to which all \$20.3 billion of U.S. foreign assistance under the authority of the Department of State and USAID, as well as resources provided by the Millennium Challenge Corporation, are applied. The new Strategic Framework for U.S. Foreign Assistance articulates a strategy for achieving the transformational diplomacy goal, focusing on five objectives that together address the underlying causes of persistent poverty, despotic governance, economic stagnation, and insecurity.

The Department of Defense has:

- Identified and started to take action on many limitations on unity of effort and meeting irregular challenges, as identified in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review, which include:
  - Training and education initiatives such as the expansion of the Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute and the establishment of the Joint Center for International Security Force Assistance and the establishment with the State Department of a Center for Complex operations;

- Efforts to increase the culture and language skills necessary for U.S. forces to work effectively with strategic partners overseas;
  - Initiatives to improve interagency operations overseas and at home, to include examining ways in which Combatant Commanders may coordinate more closely with Chiefs of Mission and other State Department offices; exploring improved interagency training and education; supporting new authorizations and appropriations to make available resources for other agencies and departments involved in the War on Terrorism and stability operations; and examining new interagency planning processes; and
  - Reform of the Regional Centers for Security Studies to be more effective outreach, training, and education tools for Combatant Commanders.
- 
- Developed the Military Support for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations (SSTR) Directive to provide strategic guidance for the U.S. military to change its planning, training, and preparing to conduct and support stability operations, and designating that stability operations are a core military mission given priority comparable with combat.
  - Ensured that the global posture of U.S. forces is managed effectively to meet Department of Defense planning and security cooperation requirements.
  - Emphasized building partnership capacity as a primary focus for the Department of Defense and began necessary reforms to ensure that building partnership capacity is effectively managed as a Department of Defense portfolio, with adequate attention to planning, programming, and budgeting.
  - Identified and reformed planning processes to better meet irregular challenges by emphasizing partner nation security capacity building and preventive lines of operation.
  - Incorporated critical elements of partnership capacity into operational and contingency planning for U.S. military forces and initiated a process to open planning to interagency participation.

- Realigned the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and key offices in the Joint Staff to support strategy-driven policy to build effective international partnerships.
- Established new Strategic Communications Integration Group and a Policy office for Defense Support to Public Diplomacy to integrate and synchronize Strategic Communications efforts vital to effective partnerships.

## SECTION IV

### **Conclusion: Ensuring the Efficacy of Security Assistance**

The intent of these recommendations is to provide a flexible, timely, and effective whole-of-government approach to today's security environment that is well coordinated in the interagency both in Washington at the policy level and in the field at the operational level, and with appropriate, relevant oversight by Congress. The recommendations in this report can address some persistent challenges by providing supplemental tools and resources. Building effective civilian and military partnerships overseas will advance the shared national security goals of the United States and its partners and help people around the world build better, safer lives. Efficient interagency solutions are possible – we have created them for narrow sectors and, when pressed, for crisis response. This report provides a starting place for broader consideration of additional supplementary authorities and sufficient resources that will ensure that security assistance is a strategic, responsive, and effective tool to shape the future.

We will continue to improve our internal processes and policies to ensure the efficacy of security assistance, working closely with the Department of Defense in so doing. We also hope to continue working closely with the Congress to ensure that we are maximizing the use of USG funds – for sustainable, accountable, and fully transparent security assistance efforts serving shared foreign policy and national security objectives in a rapidly changing strategic and operational environment.