

**Written Statement**  
**of**  
**Shawn Reese**  
**Analyst in Emergency Management and Homeland Security Policy**  
**Before**  
**Committee on Homeland Security**  
**Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency**  
**House of Representatives**  
**February 15, 2013**  
**“Assessing DHS 10 Years Later: How Wisely is DHS Spending Taxpayer Dollars?”**

## **Introduction**

Chairman Duncan, Ranking Member Barber, and Members of the Subcommittee, on behalf of the Congressional Research Service I would like to thank you for this opportunity to appear before you to discuss national homeland security strategy, definitions, and priorities.

The Subcommittee requested that CRS discuss the implications of the absence of a federal government-wide national homeland security strategy, the use of multiple definitions of homeland security in national strategic documents, the lack of national homeland security priorities, and the funding of these priorities. This written statement is drawn largely from my CRS report *Defining Homeland Security: Analysis and Congressional Considerations*.

Accordingly, my statement summarizes key portions of this report, and addresses key findings which include the absence of a consensus definition of homeland security and priorities. My statement concludes with an analysis of the potential consequences stemming from the lack of a consensus homeland security definition, the absence of homeland security priorities, and how this may affect the funding and execution of critical homeland security activities.

## **Current Homeland Security Environment**

Congress and policymakers are responsible for funding homeland security priorities. These priorities need to exist, to be clear and cogent, in order for funding to be most effective. Presently, as DHS itself has stated, homeland security is not funded on clearly defined priorities. In an ideal scenario, there would be a clear definition of homeland security, and a consensus about it; as well as prioritized missions, goals, and activities. Policymakers could then use a process to incorporate feedback and respond to new facts and situations as they develop. However, more than ten years after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, policymakers continue to grapple with the definition of homeland security. For example, the U.S. government does not have a single definition for “homeland security.” Currently, different strategic documents and mission statements offer varying missions that are derived from different homeland security definitions.

Historically, the strategic documents framing national homeland security policy have included national strategies produced by the White House and documents developed by the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). Prior to the 2010 *National Security Strategy*, the 2002 and 2007 *National Strategies for Homeland Security* were the guiding documents produced by the White House. In 2011, the White House issued the *National Strategy for Counterterrorism*.

In conjunction with these White House strategies, DHS has developed a series of evolving strategic documents that are based on the two national homeland security strategies and include the 2008 *Strategic Plan—One Team, One Mission, Securing the Homeland*; the 2010 *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review and Bottom-Up Review*; and the 2012 *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan*. The 2012 DHS strategic plan is the latest evolution in DHS’s

process of defining its mission, goals, and responsibilities. This plan, however, only addresses the department's homeland security purview and is not a document that addresses homeland security missions and responsibilities that are shared across the federal government.

Today, 30 federal entities receive annual homeland security funding excluding the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) estimates that 48% of annual homeland security funding is appropriated to these federal entities, with the Department of Defense (DOD) receiving approximately 26% of total federal homeland security funding. DHS receives approximately 52%.<sup>1</sup>

Currently, the Department of Homeland Security is developing the 2014 *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR)*, which is scheduled to be issued in late 2013 or early 2014. Given the anticipated issuance of this latest QHSR, this might be an ideal time to review the concept of homeland security, the definition of the term "homeland security," and how the concept and definition of homeland security affect congressional appropriations and the identification of priorities as established by DHS and the Administration.

## **Evolution of Homeland Security Strategic Documents**

The concept of homeland security is evolving. One may argue that it might even be waning as a separate policy concept. Evidence for this viewpoint can be found in the current Administration's incorporation of the homeland security staff into the national security staff and the inclusion of homeland security priorities within the 2010 *National Security Strategy*. There has not been a national homeland security strategy since 2007. Additionally, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has announced that it will no longer require federal departments and agencies to identify homeland security funding with their FY2014 budget request submissions.<sup>2</sup>

The evolution of the homeland security concept has been communicated in several strategic documents. Today, strategic documents provide guidance to all involved federal entities and include the 2010 *National Security Strategy* and the 2011 *National Strategy for Counterterrorism*. There are also strategic documents that provide specific guidance to DHS entities and include the 2010 *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review*, the *Bottom-Up Review*, and the 2012 *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan*. Prior to issuance of these documents, national and DHS homeland security strategic documents included the 2002 and 2007 *National Strategies for Homeland Security* and the 2008 *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan*. All of these documents have varying definitions for "homeland security" and varying missions have been derived from these definitions.

---

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Office of Management and Budget, Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2013: Analytical Perspectives, February 2012, "Appendix – Homeland Security Mission Funding by Agency and Budget Account," [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2013/assets/homeland\\_supp.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2013/assets/homeland_supp.pdf).

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.performance.gov/sites/default/files/tmp/\\_List\\_of\\_Reports\\_Required\\_by\\_P\\_L%20\\_111-352.xls](http://www.performance.gov/sites/default/files/tmp/_List_of_Reports_Required_by_P_L%20_111-352.xls)

While the definitions and missions embodied in these strategic documents have commonalities, there are significant differences. Natural disasters are specifically identified as an integral part of homeland security in five of the seven documents, and only three documents—the 2008 and 2012 DHS *Strategic Plans* and the *Bottom-Up Review*—specifically include border and maritime security and immigration in their homeland security definitions. All of these mentioned issues are important and involve significant funding requests. However, the lack of consensus about the inclusion of these policy areas in a definition of homeland security may have negative or unproductive consequences for national homeland security operations. A consensus definition would be useful, but may not be sufficient. A clear prioritization of strategic missions would help focus and direct federal entities’ homeland security activities. Additionally, prioritization affects Congress’s authorization, appropriation, and oversight activities. Ultimately, DHS’ current efforts to design and issue the forthcoming QHSR may be important in the debate on homeland security strategy.

## **Quadrennial Homeland Security Review**

In August 2007, Congress enacted the Implementing 9/11 Commission Recommendations Act<sup>3</sup> which required the DHS Secretary to conduct a quadrennial review of homeland security. This review was to be a comprehensive examination of the homeland security strategy of the Nation, including recommendations regarding the long-term strategy and priorities of the Nation for homeland security and guidance on the programs, assets, capabilities, budget, policies, and authorities of the Department.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, the DHS Secretary was to consult with the “heads of other Federal agencies” and delineate and update, as appropriate, the national homeland security strategy, consistent with appropriate national and Departmental strategies, strategic plans, and Homeland Security Presidential Directives, including the National Strategy for Homeland Security, the National Response Plan, and the Department Security Strategic Plan.<sup>5</sup>

These updates were to “prioritize the full range of the critical homeland security mission areas of the Nation.”<sup>6</sup> Many knowledgeable observers concluded that the 2010 *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review* did not accomplish these requirements. For example, David Maurer, Director of the Government Accountability Office’s Homeland Security and Justice Team stated before the House Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and

---

<sup>3</sup> P.L. 110-53.

<sup>4</sup> 121 Stat. 544, 6 U.S.C. 347.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

Management on February 3, 2013, that the 2010 QHSR identified five key DHS missions but did not prioritize them as required by the 9/11 Commission Act.<sup>7</sup> Additionally, Alan Cohn, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Policy, DHS, stated, in February 2012, that the department was still in the process of aligning resources with priorities. However, that process was not completed for the 2010 QHSR.<sup>8</sup>

The continued absence of homeland security priorities may be the result of competing or differing definitions of homeland security within national strategic documents and the evolving concept of homeland security. However, prior to 9/11 such entities as the Gilmore Commission<sup>9</sup> and the United States Commission on National Security<sup>10</sup> discussed the need to evolve the way national security policy was conceptualized due to the end of the Cold War and the rise of radicalized terrorism. After 9/11, policymakers concluded that a new approach was needed to address the large-scale terrorist attacks. A presidential council and department were established, and a series of presidential directives were issued in the name of “homeland security.” These developments established that homeland security was a distinct, but undefined concept.<sup>11</sup> Later, the federal, state, and local government responses to disasters such as Hurricane Katrina expanded the concept of homeland security to include significant disasters, major public health emergencies, and other events that threaten the United States, its economy, the rule of law, and government operations.<sup>12</sup>

## Definitions and Missions as Part of Strategy Development

Definitions and missions are part of strategy development. Policymakers develop strategy by identifying national interests, prioritizing missions to achieve those national interests, and arraying instruments of national power to achieve national interests.<sup>13</sup> Strategy is not developed within a vacuum. President Barack Obama’s Administration’s 2010 *National Security Strategy*

---

<sup>7</sup> David Maurer, Government Accountability Office, statement before the House Homeland Security Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, “Is DHS Effectively Implementing a Strategy to Counter Emerging Threats?” hearing, 112th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 3, 2012.

<sup>8</sup> Alan Cohn, Department of Homeland Security, statement before the House Homeland Security Committee, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, “Is DHS Effectively Implementing a Strategy to Counter Emerging Threats?” hearing, 112th Cong., 2nd sess., Feb. 3, 2012.

<sup>9</sup> For information on the Gilmore Commission, see <http://www.rand.org/nsrd/terrpanel.html>. The Gilmore Commission was established prior to 9/11; however, it released its fifth and final report in December 2003.

<sup>10</sup> For information on the U.S. Commission on National Security, see <http://www.fas.org/irp/threat/nssg.pdf>. The U.S. Commission on National Security was established in 1998 and issued its final report in February 2001. The commission did reference the idea of “homeland security” in early 2001.

<sup>11</sup> Harold C. Relyea, “Homeland Security and Information,” *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 19, 2002, p. 219.

<sup>12</sup> Nadav Morag, “Does Homeland Security Exist Outside the United States?,” *Homeland Security Affairs*, vol. 7, September 2011, p. 1.

<sup>13</sup> Terry L. Deibel, *Foreign Affairs Strategy: Logic for American Statecraft* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007), p. 5.

states that strategy is meant to recognize “the world as it is” and mold it into “the world we seek.”<sup>14</sup> Developing a homeland security strategy, however, may be complicated if the key concept of homeland security is not succinctly defined, and strategic missions are not aligned and synchronized among different strategic documents and federal entities.

## Definitions

The following table provides examples of strategic documents and their specific homeland security definitions.

**Table 1. Summary of Homeland Security Definitions**

Document	Definition
2007 <i>National Strategy for Homeland Security</i> (White House)	A concerted national effort to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States, reduce America’s vulnerability to terrorism, and minimize the damage and recover from attacks that do occur. <sup>a</sup>
2008 <i>U.S. Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan, Fiscal Years 2008-2013</i> (DHS)	A unified national effort to prevent and deter terrorist attacks, protect and respond to hazards, and to secure the national borders. <sup>b</sup>
2010 <i>National Security Strategy</i> (White House)	A seamless coordination among federal, state, and local governments to prevent, protect against and respond to threats and natural disasters. <sup>c</sup>
2010 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (DHS)	A concerted national effort to ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards where American interests, aspirations, and ways of life can thrive. <sup>d</sup>
2010 <i>Bottom-Up Review</i> (DHS)	Preventing terrorism, responding to and recovering from natural disasters, customs enforcement and collection of customs revenue, administration of legal immigration services, safety and stewardship of the Nation’s waterways and marine transportation system, as well as other legacy missions of the various components of DHS. <sup>e</sup>
2011 <i>National Strategy For Counterterrorism</i> (White House)	Defensive efforts to counter terrorist threats. <sup>f</sup>

<sup>14</sup> Executive Office of the President, *National Security Strategy*, Washington, DC, May 2010, p. 9.

2012 <i>Strategic Plan</i> (DHS)	Efforts to ensure a homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards. <sup>8</sup>
----------------------------------	--

- a. Office of the President, Homeland Security Council, *The National Homeland Security Strategy*, Washington, DC, October 2007, p. 1.
- b. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *One Team, One Mission, Securing the Homeland: U.S. Homeland Security Strategic Plan, Fiscal Years 2008-2013*, Washington, DC, 2008, p. 3.
- c. Office of the President, *National Security Strategy*, Washington, DC, May 2010, p. 2.
- d. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review*, Washington, DC, February 2010, p. 13.
- e. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Bottom-Up Review*, Washington, DC, July 2010, p. 3.
- f. Office of the President, National Strategy for Counterterrorism, Washington, DC, June 2011, p. 11.
- g. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan: Fiscal Years 2012–2016*, Washington, DC, February 2012, p. 2. This document does not explicitly state a definition for “homeland security” but it does define DHS’s “vision.”

Some common themes among these definitions are:

- the homeland security enterprise encompasses a federal, state, local, and tribal government and private sector approach that requires coordination;
- homeland security can involve securing against and responding to both hazard-specific and all-hazards threats; and
- homeland security activities do not imply total protection or complete threat reduction.

Each of these documents highlights the importance of coordinating homeland security missions and activities. However, individual federal, state, local, and tribal government efforts are not identified in the documents.

The competing and varied definitions in these documents may indicate that there is no succinct homeland security concept. Without a succinct homeland security concept, policymakers and entities with homeland security responsibilities may not successfully coordinate or focus on the highest prioritized or most necessary activities. Coordination is especially essential to homeland security because of the multiple federal agencies and the state and local partners with whom they interact. Coordination may be difficult if these entities do not operate with the same understanding of the homeland security concept. For example, definitions that don’t specifically include immigration or natural disaster response and recovery may result in homeland security stakeholders and federal entities not adequately resourcing and focusing on these activities. Additionally, an absence of a consensus definition may result in Congress funding a homeland

security activity that DHS does not consider a priority. For example, Congress may appropriate funding for a counterterrorism program such as the State Homeland Security Grant Program when DHS may have identified an all-hazards grant program, such as Emergency Management Performance Grant Program, as a priority.

It is, however, possible that a consensus definition and overall concept exists among policymakers and federal entities, but that it isn't communicated in the strategic documents.<sup>15</sup>

Finally, DHS Deputy Secretary Jane Lute stated that homeland security "... is operation, it's transactional, it's decentralized, it's bottom-driven," and influenced by law enforcement, emergency management, and the political environment. Conversely, DHS Deputy Secretary Lute stated that national security "... is strategic, it's centralized, it's top-driven," and influenced by the military and the intelligence community.<sup>16</sup> Some see these comments as a reflection of a DHS attempt to establish a homeland security definition that is more operational than strategic and an illustration of the complexity of a common understanding of homeland security and its associated missions. Additionally, Congress has defined homeland security as

(11) Homeland security

The term 'homeland security' includes efforts –

(A) to prevent terrorist attacks within the United States;

(B) to reduce the vulnerability of the United States to terrorism;

(C) to minimize damage from a terrorist attack in the United States; and

(D) to recover from a terrorist attack in the United States.<sup>17</sup>

## **Varied Missions**

Varied homeland security definitions, in numerous documents, result in homeland security stakeholders identifying and executing varied strategic missions. Homeland security stakeholders include federal departments and agencies, state and local governments, and non-profit and non-governmental organizations. The strategic documents mentioned earlier and listed in the CRS report identify numerous homeland security missions such as terrorism prevention; response and recovery; critical infrastructure protection and resilience; federal, state, and local emergency management and preparedness; and border security. As noted earlier, none of these documents

---

<sup>15</sup> Examination of such a possibility is beyond the scope of this testimony.

<sup>16</sup> Christopher Bellavita, "A new perspective on homeland security?" Homeland Security Watch, December 20, 2011, <http://www.hlswatch.com/2011/12/20/a-new-perspective-on-homeland-security/>.

<sup>17</sup> The Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended, sec. 722(11). This definition is exclusive "for the purposes of this act."



specifically tasks a federal entity with the overall responsibility for homeland security. The following table summarizes the varied missions in these strategic documents.

**Table 2. Summary of Homeland Security Missions and Goals**

Document	Missions and Goals
<p>2007 <i>National Strategy for Homeland Security</i> (White House)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prevent and disrupt terrorist attacks.</li> <li>- Protect the American people, critical infrastructure, and key resources.</li> <li>- Respond to and recover from incidents that do occur.</li> <li>- Strengthen the foundation to ensure long term success.<sup>a</sup></li> </ul>
<p>2008 <i>U.S. Department of Homeland Security Strategic Plan, Fiscal Years 2008-2013</i> (DHS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protect the nation from dangerous people.</li> <li>- Protect the nation from dangerous goods.</li> <li>- Protect critical infrastructure.</li> <li>- Strengthen the nation’s preparedness and emergency response capabilities.</li> <li>- Strengthen and unify the department’s operations and management.<sup>b</sup></li> </ul>
<p>2010 <i>National Security Strategy</i> (White House)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Strengthen national capacity.</li> <li>- Ensure security and prosperity at home.</li> <li>- Secure cyberspace.</li> <li>- Ensure American economic prosperity.<sup>c</sup></li> </ul>
<p>2010 <i>Quadrennial Homeland Security Review</i> (DHS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prevent terrorism and enhance security.</li> <li>- Secure and manage our borders.</li> <li>- Enforce and administer our immigration laws.</li> <li>- Safeguard and secure cyberspace.</li> <li>- Ensure resilience to disasters.<sup>d</sup></li> <li>- Provide essential support to national and economic security.<sup>e</sup></li> </ul>

<p>2010 <i>Bottom-Up Review</i> (DHS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Prevent terrorism and enhance security.</li> <li>- Secure and manage borders.</li> <li>- Enforce and manage immigration laws.</li> <li>- Safeguard and secure cyberspace.</li> <li>- Ensure resilience to disasters.</li> <li>- Improve departmental management and accountability.<sup>f</sup></li> </ul>
<p>2011 <i>National Strategy for Counterterrorism</i> (White House)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protect the American people, homeland, and American interests.</li> <li>- Eliminate threats to the American people's, homeland's, and interests' physical safety.</li> <li>- Counter threats to global peace and security.</li> <li>- Promote and protect U.S. interests around the globe.<sup>g</sup> <small>Error! Reference source not found.</small></li> </ul>
<p>2012 <i>Strategic Plan</i> (DHS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preventing terrorism and enhancing security.</li> <li>- Securing and managing our borders.</li> <li>- Enforcing and administering our immigration laws.</li> <li>- Safeguarding and securing cyberspace.</li> <li>- Ensuring resilience to disasters.<sup>h</sup></li> <li>- Providing essential support to national and economic security.<sup>i</sup></li> </ul>

- a. Office of the President, Homeland Security Council, *National Strategy for Homeland Security*, Washington, DC, October 2007, p. 1.
- b. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *One Team, One Mission, Securing the Homeland: U.S. Homeland Security Strategic Plan, Fiscal Years 2008-2013*, Washington, DC, 2008, p. 6-25.
- c. Office of the President, *National Security Strategy*, Washington, DC, May 2010, p. 14.
- d. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review*, Washington, DC, February 2010, p. 2.
- e. This mission of providing essential support to national and economic security was not part of the 2010 Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, but has been subsequently added as an additional mission. U.S. Government Accountability Office, *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review: Enhanced Stakeholder*

*Consultation and Use of Risk Information Could Strengthen Future Reviews*, GAO-11-873, September 2011, p. 9.

- f. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Bottom-Up Review*, Washington, DC, July 2010, pp. i-ii.
- g. Office of the President, *National Strategy for Counterterrorism*, Washington, DC, June 2011, p. 8.
- h. U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Goal: Fiscal Years 2012 – 2016*, Washington, DC, February 2012, pp. 3-18.
- i. The 2012 Strategic Plan does not designate this as a specific mission, but it does state that “DHS contributes in many ways to these elements to broader U.S. national and economic security while fulfilling its homeland security missions.” U.S. Department of Homeland Security, *Department of Homeland Security Strategic Goal: Fiscal Years 2012–2016*, Washington, DC, February 2012, p. 19.

These documents all identify specific missions as essential to securing the nation. All of the documents state that the nation’s populace, critical infrastructure, and key resources need protection from terrorism and disasters. This protection from both terrorism and disasters is a key strategic homeland security mission. Some, but not all, of the documents include missions related to border security, immigration, the economy, and general resilience. Members of Congress and congressional committees, however, have sometimes criticized these documents.

Senator Susan Collins—current ranking Member, Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs—expressed disappointment in the 2010 *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review* and 2010 *Bottom-Up Review* arguing that they did not communicate priorities and did not compare favorably to the most recent *Quadrennial Defense Review*.<sup>18</sup> The *Quadrennial Defense Review* identifies national security and U.S. military priorities through a process “...from objectives to capabilities and activities to resources.”<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, the *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review* missions are different from the 2007 *National Strategy for Homeland Security*<sup>20</sup> missions, and neither identifies priorities, or resources, for DHS, or for other federal agencies. Since the *National Strategy for Homeland Security* and the *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review* missions are differing and varied, and because the *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review* does not specifically identify a strategic process to achieve the missions, it could be assumed that this document was meant to be solely operational guidance. Additionally, some critics found the *Bottom-Up Review* lacking in detail and failing to meet its intended purpose.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, *Charting a Path Forward: The Homeland Security Department’s Quadrennial Review and Bottom-Up Review*, 111<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., July 21, 2010.

<sup>19</sup> U.S. Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review*, Washington, DC, February 2010, p. iii.

<sup>20</sup> The 2007 *National Strategy for Homeland Security* is the most recent national strategy specifically on homeland security.

<sup>21</sup> Katherine McIntire Peters, “DHS Bottom-Up Review is long on ambition, short on detail,” *GovernmentExecutive.com*, July 2010.

Further congressional criticism included an observation on the absence of a single DHS strategy. At a House Homeland Security Committee’s Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations and Management hearing, Chairman Michael McCaul stated that “...DHS needs a single strategic document which subordinate agencies can follow and make sure the strategy is effectively and efficiently implemented. This single document should conform to the National Security Strategy of the United States of America. If the agencies do not have a clearly established list of priorities, it will be difficult to complete assigned missions.”<sup>22</sup>

## **Federal Homeland Security Mission Activities and Funding**

The strategic homeland security documents provide federal entities information on the national approach to homeland security. These documents are intended to identify federal entity responsibilities in the area of homeland security and assist federal entities in determining how to allocate federal funding for that purpose. As mentioned earlier, in FY2012 30 federal departments, agencies, and entities received annual homeland security funding excluding DHS. OMB estimates that 48% of annual homeland security funding is appropriated to these federal entities, with DOD receiving approximately 26% of total federal homeland security funding. DHS receives approximately 52%.

In an effort to measure federal homeland security funding, Congress required OMB to include a homeland security funding analysis in each presidential budget.<sup>23</sup> OMB requires federal departments, agencies, and entities to provide budget request amounts based on the following six 2003 National Strategy for Homeland Security mission areas:

- Intelligence and Warning;
- Border and Transportation Security;
- Domestic Counterterrorism;
- Protecting Critical Infrastructure and Key Assets;
- Defending against Catastrophic Threats; and
- Emergency Preparedness and Response.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> U.S. Congress, House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, *Is DHS Effectively Implementing a Strategy to Counter Emerging Threats?*, 112<sup>th</sup> Cong., 2<sup>nd</sup> sess., February 3, 2012.

<sup>23</sup> P.L. 107-296 (Homeland Security Act of 2002), sec. 889.

<sup>24</sup> Office of Management and Budget, Circular No. A-11: Preparation, Submission, and Execution of the Budget, Instructions for Homeland Security Data Collection, Washington, DC, August 2011, [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/a11\\_current\\_year/homeland.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/assets/a11_current_year/homeland.pdf).

OMB, however, notes that the National Strategy for Homeland Security was revised in 2007, and that revision consolidated these six mission areas into three: (1) prevent and disrupt terrorist attacks; (2) protect the American people, critical infrastructure, and key resources; and (3) respond to and recover from incidents that do occur. The strategy also states that these original 2003 mission areas are still used to ensure “continuity and granularity.”<sup>25</sup> OMB does not address President Obama Administration’s issuance of the 2010 National Security Strategy which supersedes the 2007 National Strategy for Homeland Security. It should be noted that OMB, in the FY2014 budget request is not requesting federal agencies to identify homeland security mission amounts in their submissions. This may further hamper the ability to track federal funding for homeland security activities and restrict the ability to determine if funding aligns with national homeland security priorities. The following table shows the amount of funding provided for homeland security missions for FY2012 and the amount requested for FY2013 by agency.

**Table 3. FY2012 Appropriations and FY2013 Request for Homeland Security Mission Funding by Agency**(budget authority in millions of dollars)

Department	FY2012 Enacted	FY2013 Request	FY2013 Request as % of Total
Agriculture	\$570.1	\$551.4	0.80%
Commerce	\$289.6	\$304.1	0.44%
Defense	\$17,358.4	\$17,955.1	26.05%
Education	\$30.9	\$35.5	0.05%
Energy	\$1,923.3	\$1,874.7	2.72%
Health and Human Services	\$4,146.8	\$4,112.2	5.97%
Homeland Security	\$35,214.7	\$35,533.7	51.57%
Housing and Urban Development	\$3.0	\$3.0	— <sup>i</sup>
Interior	\$57.6	\$56.7	0.08%
Justice	\$4,055.4	\$3,992.8	5.79%
Labor	\$46.3	\$36.6	0.05%

<sup>25</sup> Ibid.

<b>Department</b>	<b>FY2012 Enacted</b>	<b>FY2013 Request</b>	<b>FY2013 Request as % of Total</b>
State	\$2,283.4	\$2,353.8	3.42%
Transportation	\$246.6	\$243.3	0.35%
Treasury	\$123.0	\$121.1	0.18%
Veterans Affairs	\$394.5	\$383.7	0.56%
Corps of Engineers	\$35.5	\$35.5	0.05%
Environmental Protection Agency	\$101.8	\$102.6	0.15%
Executive Office of the President	\$10.4	\$11.0	0.02%
General Services Administration	\$38.0	\$59.0	0.09%
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	\$228.9	\$216.1	0.31%
National Science Foundation	\$443.9	\$425.9	0.62%
Office of Personnel Management	\$1.3	\$0.6	j
Social Security Administration	\$234.3	\$252.1	0.37%
District of Columbia	\$15.0	\$25.0	0.04%
Federal Communications Commission	—	\$1.7	— <sup>k</sup>
Intelligence Community Management Account	\$8.8	—	—

Department	FY2012 Enacted	FY2013 Request	FY2013 Request as % of Total
National Archives and Records Administration	\$22.6	\$22.5	0.03%
Nuclear Regulatory Commission	\$78.4	\$76.6	0.11%
Securities and Exchange Commission	\$8.0	\$8.0	0.01%
Smithsonian Institution	\$97.0	\$100.1	0.15%
U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum	\$11.0	\$11.0	0.02%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$67,988.0</b>	<b>\$68,905.2<sup>1</sup></b>	<b>100%<sup>0</sup></b>

**Source:** U.S. Office of Management and Budget, *Budget of the United States Government, Fiscal Year 2013: Analytical Perspectives*, February 2012, “Appendix – Homeland Security Mission Funding by Agency and Budget Account,” [http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2013/assets/homeland\\_supp.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/omb/budget/fy2013/assets/homeland_supp.pdf).

- i. This amount is less than 0.01%.
- j. This amount is less than 0.01%.
- k. This amount is less than 0.01%.
- l. The majority of this funding is categorized as protecting critical infrastructure and key assets.
- e. Percentages in column may not equal 100 due to rounding.

This allocation of federal homeland security funding reveals that approximately 50% of federal funding is *not* appropriated for DHS missions or activities. Additionally, it could mean that relying on detailed DHS strategies may be insufficient for developing a structured and coherent national homeland security, and that a coordinating and encompassing national homeland security definition may be important to prioritizing homeland security activities and funding.

The 2010 *National Security Strategy* states that homeland security is “a seamless coordination among federal, state, and local governments to prevent, protect against, and respond to threats and natural disasters.”<sup>26</sup> Homeland security requires coordination because numerous federal, state, and local entities have responsibility for various homeland security activities. The

<sup>26</sup> Office of the President, *National Security Strategy*, Washington, DC, May 2010, p. 2.

proliferation of responsibilities entitled “homeland security activities” is due to a couple of factors. One factor is that homeland security developed from the pre-9/11 concept of law enforcement and emergency management. Another factor is the continuously evolving definition of “homeland security.” Some degree of evolution of the homeland security concept is expected. Policymakers respond to events and crises like terrorist attacks and natural disasters by using and adjusting strategies, plans, and operations. These strategies, plans, and operations also evolve to reflect changing priorities. The definition of homeland security evolves in accordance with the evolution of these strategies, plans, and operations.

## **Congressional Considerations**

Policymakers are faced with a complex and detailed list of risks, or threats to security, for which they then attempt to plan. However, some have argued that managing those risks correctly 99% of the time may not be good enough when even a single failure may lead to significant human and financial costs.<sup>27</sup> Homeland security is essentially about managing risks. The purpose of a strategic process is to develop missions to achieve that end. Before risk management can be accurate and adequate, policymakers ideally coordinate and communicate. That work to some degree depends on developing a foundation of common definitions of key terms and concepts. It is also necessary, in order to best coordinate and communicate, to ensure stakeholders are aware of, trained for, and prepared to meet assigned missions. At the national level, there does yet not appear to be alignment of homeland security definitions and missions among disparate federal entities. DHS is, however, attempting to align its definition and missions, but does not prioritize its missions; there is clarity lacking in the national strategies of federal, state, and local roles and responsibilities; and, potentially, some may argue that funding is driving priorities rather than priorities driving the funding.

DHS is aligning its definition and missions in the *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review*, the *Bottom-Up Review*, and the *2012 Strategic Plan*; however, DHS does not prioritize the missions. DHS prioritizes specific goals, objectives, activities, and specific initiatives within the missions, and prioritizes initiatives across the missions. There is still no single national homeland security definition, nor is there a prioritization of national homeland security or DHS missions.

There is no evidence in the existing homeland security strategic documents that supports the aligning and prioritization of the varied missions, nor do any of the documents appear to convey how national, state, or local resources are to be allocated to achieve these missions. Without prioritized resource allocation to align missions, proponents of prioritization of the nation’s homeland security activities and operations maintain that plans and responses may be haphazard

---

<sup>27</sup> Donald F. Kettl, *System Under Stress: Homeland Security and American Politics*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Washington, DC, CQPress, 2007, p. 82.



and inconsistent. Another potential consequence of the absence of clear missions is that available funding then tends to govern the priorities.

Congress may decide to address the issues associated with homeland security strategy, definitions, and missions, in light of the potential for significant events to occur similar to the 9/11 terrorist attacks and Hurricanes Katrina and Sandy. Many observers assert that these outstanding policy issues result from the varied definitions and missions identified in numerous national strategic documents. Additionally, they note that these documents do not consistently address risk mitigation associated with the full range of homeland security threats. From this perspective one piece missing from these documents, and their guidance, is a discussion of the resources and fiscal costs associated with preparing for low risk, but high consequence threats.

Specifically, Congress may choose to consider a number of options addressing the apparent lack of a consensus homeland security definition that prioritizes missions by requiring the development of a more succinct, and distinct, national homeland security strategy. One of these options might be to require a total rewrite of a national homeland security strategy. This option would be similar to the Bush Administration's issuance of national homeland security strategies in 2002 and 2007. Such a strategy could include a definitive listing of mission priorities based on an encompassing definition that not only includes DHS specific responsibilities, but all federal department and agency responsibilities. A strategy that includes priorities could improve Congress's and other policymakers' ability to make choices between competing homeland security missions. This option would also be a departure from the current Administration's practice of including national homeland security guidance in the *National Security Strategy*.

Another option would be to build upon the current approach by requiring the Administration to develop the *National Security Strategy* that succinctly identifies homeland security missions and priorities. Alternatively, Congress may determine that the present course of including national homeland security guidance in the *National Security Strategy* is adequate, and may focus strictly on DHS activities. This option would entail DHS further refining its *Quadrennial Homeland Security Review* which it has begun to do with its 2012 *Strategic Plan* and as it prepares the 2014 QHSR.

It has been argued that homeland security, at its core, is about coordination because of the disparate stakeholders and risks.<sup>28</sup> Many observers assert that homeland security is not only about coordination of resources and actions to counter risks; it is also about the coordination of the strategic process policymakers use in determining the risks, the stakeholders and their missions, and the prioritization of those missions.

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid.

Without a general consensus on the physical and philosophical definition and missions of homeland security, achieved through a strategic process, some believe that there will continue to be the potential for disjointed and disparate approaches to securing the nation. From this perspective general consensus on the homeland security concept necessarily starts with a consensus definition and an accepted list of prioritized missions that are constantly reevaluated to meet risks of the new paradigm that is homeland security in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. These varied definitions and missions, however, may be the result of a strategic process that has attempted to adjust federal homeland security policy to continually emerging threats and risks.

Thank you.