# Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Estimates Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA)



May 2009

(This page intentionally left blank.)

#### Operation and Maintenance, Defense-Wide Summary (\$ in thousands) Budget Activity (BA) 4: Administrative & Service-wide Activities

	FY 2008	Price	Program	FY 2009	Price	Program	FY 2010
	<u>Actuals</u>	Change	Change	<u>Estimate</u>	Change	Change	<u>Estimate</u>
DSCA	1,820,957	38,526	-1,231,659	627,824	9,924	84,008	721,756

- \* FY 2008 Actual column includes \$260,097 thousand of FY 2007 Coalition Support Fund (CSF)(X-year)(P.L. 109-289), \$200,000 thousand of FY 2007 CSF (X-Year) (P.L. 110-28), \$300,000 thousand of FY 2008 Bridge Supplemental (X-year)(P.L. 110-161), \$318,816 thousand of FY 2008 Supplemental (X-Year) (P.L. 110-252), \$100,000 thousand of FY 2008 Bridge Supplemental, Lift and Sustain (P.L. 110-161), \$200,000 thousand of FY 2008 Supplemental, Lift and Sustain (P.L. 110-252) and \$7,222 thousand of Supplemental for Coalition Support (X-year) prior year unobligated balance carryover.
- \* FY 2009 column excludes \$1,730,000 thousand for FY 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations (\$1,250,000 thousand of FY 2009 Coalition Support Funds (\$200,000 included in FY 2009 Bridge Supplemental), \$450,000 thousand of FY 2009 Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan) 0(\$100,000 thousand included in FY 2009 Bridge Supplemental), and \$30,000 thousand FY 2009 Kyrgyz Republic) and \$528,517 thousand Supplemental for Coalition Support (X-year) prior year unobligated balance carryover.
- \* FY 2010 column excludes \$1,950,000 thousand for FY 2010 Overseas Contingency Operations (\$1,600,000 thousand of FY 2010 Coalition Support Funds, and \$350,000 thousand of FY 2010 Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan).
- I. <u>Description of Operations Financed</u>: The Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) administers funding for the Regional Centers for Security Studies, Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace Program, Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program, Consortium for Complex Operations, Regional International Outreach, Cooperation Training and Support formally called International Programs Security Requirements Course, Global Train and Equip Program, Security and Stabilization Security Assistance, Defense Institution Reform Initiative, Increasing Partner Capacity Building in Rule of Law Context, Coalition Support Funds, and Lift and Sustain Support. The DSCA also provides program management and program implementation support to the Humanitarian Assistance, Foreign Disaster Relief, and Humanitarian Mine Action programs, which are funded in a separate appropriation.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

Changes from FY 2009 to FY 2010: Price changes, including Foreign Currency Fluctuations, are \$+9,924 thousand. After considering the effects of inflation the net program change is an increase of \$+84,008 thousand.

Funding increases support the Guidance on the Employment of the Force (GEF) and Guidance on Development of the Force that states building adequate capability and capacity to enhance the security of the United States and its partners is a Department priority. Increases totaling \$+103,751 thousand include:

- \$+96,272 thousand for Security and Stabilization Assistance which is required in anticipation of congressional expansion of current permanent authority for these programs and to assist U.S. partners in building capabilities to counter terrorism and promote stability around the world.
- \$+5,828 thousand for the Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI) that will develop partner tools to manage, sustain, and employ capabilities developed through U.S. security cooperation programs; and
- \$+1,651 the Defense Institute for International Legal Studies (DIILS) to cover infrastructure costs associated with developing and executing programs that address capacity building in rule of law context.

Based on a reduction in contractor services and affordability, the size and scope of other security cooperation programs managed by DSCA are decreased \$-19,743 thousand. The Consortium for Complex Operations (\$-2,632 thousand) transfers to National Defense University in FY 2009.

The Regional Centers for Security Studies: The Near East South Asia Center for Strategic Studies (NESA), Washington, D.C; Africa Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS), Washington,

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

D.C.; Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (APCSS), Honolulu, Hawaii; Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (CHDS), Washington, D.C. and the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies (GCMC), Garmisch, Germany are known collectively as the Regional Centers. The Regional Centers support the Department's Security Cooperation objectives and are assigned three core tasks: 1) counter ideological support for terrorism; 2) harmonize views on common security threats; and 3) build the capacity of partners' national security institutions consistent with the norms of civil-military The centers utilize unique academic forums to build strong, sustainable relations. international networks of security leaders. These networks promote enhanced policy understanding and mutually supporting approaches to security challenges (especially the de-legitimization of terrorism); effective security communities which support collective and collaborative action; and improved sustainable partner institutional capacity and capabilities, thus reducing the burden on U.S. forces worldwide. These tasks are key strategic listening and communication tools, assisting U.S. policymakers in formulating effective policy, articulating foreign perspectives to U.S. policymakers, and building support for U.S. policies abroad.

Unified management improves the Regional Centers support national security objectives by linking security communities across regions and developing friendly global networks that can defeat global terrorism networks. The Regional Centers address the following specific objectives:

• Counter ideological support for terrorism and harmonize views of common security challenges by expanding their program of seminars and courses to affect a wider and more appropriate audience in their respective regions.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

- Build partner capacity in the areas of stability operations, combating terrorism, and homeland defense by increasing functionally-focused short courses.
- Increase sustainable security communities that provide access to Department of Defense (DoD) leaders and provide critical regional policy feedback through a mix of conferences, seminars, and web-based discussion groups.
- Improve outreach and strategic listening through a physical presence in selected regions.
- Facilitate efforts to combat transnational security threats, such as terrorism, that cross Geographic Combatant Command (COCOM) boundaries through a series of collaborative working groups that partner centers and their networks.
- Synchronize Secretary of Defense priorities in curricula development to ensure that the same message is being transmitted to all representatives.
- Expand activities that leverage the network of past Regional Center graduates to advance U.S. interests, counter the influence of extremism, and share lessons learned and best practices.
- Build a federated network of functional communities of influential individuals, including U.S. personnel, who actively exchange insights on security issues, evaluate security trends, and provide feedback on national and security policies.
- Implement information technology solutions that will provide network member tracking and single-point visibility of regional center networks.
- Facilitate harmonization of regional center activities with other DoD international partner strategic education activities.

Warsaw Initiative Fund (WIF)/Partnership for Peace (PfP) Program: WIF/PfP is a unique U.S. security cooperation program designed to support developing members of the Northern

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). The WIF/PfP Program is the primary DoD tool to support PfP Partners' defense reform and NATO-interoperability efforts. The WIF/PfP objectives are based on the goals of the PfP Framework Document:

- Assist PfP Partners in building defense institutions that are transparent, accountable, and professional;
- Improve U.S./NATO-PfP Partner interoperability to enhance partner contributions to coalition operations;
- Support PfP Partner integration with NATO; and
- Ensure democratic control of the armed forces

Activities include seminars and workshops that support defense reform initiatives, functional seminars, and activities that assist partner nations to build capacity, develop capabilities, and improve interoperability with NATO and U.S. forces. These activities are critical to assisting partner countries in undertaking difficult defense institution reforms, enabling partner countries to provide support to ongoing coalition operations, and improving partner capabilities and readiness to join the NATO alliance.

In accordance with U.S. policy objectives and recent NATO Summit agreements, the WIF/PfP Program is designed to support familiarizing PfP Partners with the following priorities:

1) Defense Policy and Strategy; 2) Human Resource Management; 3) Democratic Control of the Armed Forces; 4) Defense Planning, Budgeting and Resource Management; 5) Logistics and Infrastructure; 6) Professional Defense and Military Education; 7) Stability and Peacekeeping Operations; 8) Emergency Planning/Consequence Management; 9) Border Security and Control; and 10) English Language. To support these policy objectives, WIF/PfP is used to support PfP Partners to operate with U.S. and NATO forces in military exercises,

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

actively participate in the WIF Defense Institution Building (DIB) program, and support related seminars, workshops, conferences, activities and visits.

At the 2008 NATO Summit in Bucharest, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro were invited to begin Intensified Dialogue (ID) relating to their aspirations to membership in NATO and Georgia began a series of intensified engagement. It was also agreed, in the final Summit communiqué, that Georgia and Ukraine will eventually join the Alliance.

<u>Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP)</u>: CTFP is a security cooperation program permanently authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act of 2004 (10 USC 2249c). This legislation allows DoD to provide foreign military officers and government security officials with strategic and operational education to enhance partners' capacity to combat terrorism. The goals of CTFP are:

- Build and strengthen a global network of combating terrorism experts and practitioners at the operational and strategic levels;
- Build and reinforce the combating terrorism capabilities of partner nations through operational and strategic-level education;
- Contribute to efforts to counter ideological support to terrorism; and
- Provide DoD with a flexible and proactive program that can respond to emerging combating terrorism requirements.

The CTFP is a key tool for Geographic Combatant Commands to foster regional and global cooperation in the war against terrorism. The CTFP developed mobile and resident institutional courses tailored to the specific need of key regions and countries in order

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

to advance broader U.S. Government combating terrorism objectives. All personnel are thoroughly vetted consistent with legal requirements regarding human rights issues.

The FY 2009 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) increased the CTFP authorization from \$25 million to \$35 million for efforts to defeat terrorism through counter-terrorism and anti-terrorism activities, as well as homeland defense and border control.

<u>DSCA Administrative Operations</u>: The DSCA administrative operations fund salaries and operating expenses of the personnel who manage the DoD-funded security cooperation programs noted above, along with the Humanitarian Assistance, Foreign Disaster Relief, and Mine Action program management costs.

Regional International Outreach (RIO): The RIO program is an OSD(Policy) initiative that will provide an open source information technology solution assisting the Regional Centers for Security Studies in improving international outreach efforts and fostering collaboration among their faculty, current and former participants, OSD, and other designated DoD educational institutions. The RIO outreach, education, and collaboration efforts are directly tied to building partnership capacity and countering ideological support for terrorism. The RIO is a tool that will enable faculty, current and former participants, and other users to share information, collaborate on projects, build international communities of interest, and improve administrative activities resulting in time and manpower savings. The RIO program has extended beyond the five regional centers (each with their own site), and now includes an additional five institutions. RIO will field a federated capability in FY 2009, which will tie the centers together along with the additional institutions and others using the same technology.

<u>Security Cooperation Training and Support</u>: This program, formally called International Programs Security Requirements Course, is a course of instruction in security

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

requirements for international programs for DoD and defense contractor personnel that have direct responsibility for these programs. The U.S. has many cooperative programs with allies, and foreign military sales help to ensure their strength. Every DoD employee involved in international programs must understand security arrangements, laws, policies, and procedures that govern foreign involvement in our international programs to protect sensitive and classified technology and military capabilities. This 5-day course is required for DoD or other government employees and defense contractors who have "hands-on" involvement in international programs, such as negotiating, managing, executing, or otherwise directly participating in international government or commercial programs including foreign military sales, cooperative research and development, commercial sales, license application review, systems acquisition, foreign contracting, foreign disclosure, international visits and personnel exchanges, program protection, or industrial security.

<u>Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI)</u>: DIRI is designed to help partners develop accountable, professional, and transparent defense establishments that can manage, sustain, and employ their forces and the capabilities developed through U.S. security cooperation programs. The DIRI focus areas are:

- Defense Policy & Strategy
- Human Resource Management
- Defense Planning, Budgeting and Resource Management
- Logistics & Infrastructure
- Civil-Military Relations and Interagency Coordination
- Professional Defense & Military Education

The DIRI streamlines U.S. defense reform efforts, focuses priorities and funding, and minimizes programmatic gaps. Using national strategic guidance, DoD employment guidance,

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

and State Mission Support Plans (MSPs), the DIRI will incorporate and coordinate Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Geographic CoCOMs, and country team guidance and goals to develop integrated execution plans and achieve shared objectives. The program supports security cooperation priorities identified in the GEF, which establishes defense and security sector reform as one of eight primary focus areas for security cooperation. The DIRI process consists of four distinct phases:

- 1. <u>Requirements Determination</u>: Subject matter experts along with OSD, Geographic CoCOMs, and country team support will conduct a survey to determine defense institution status. Surveys are tailored to the culture and region.
- 2. <u>Program Development</u>: A roadmap is developed based on survey findings. The DIRI roadmap is vetted by OSD, Geographic CoCOMs, and country team representatives until agreement is reached, then shared with partner.
- 3. <u>Program Implementation and Execution</u>: Sequential, country-specific activities for each roadmap block are executed. Activity providers, best suited to meet objectives work in step-by-step process to implement roadmap.
- 4. <u>Program Assessment</u>: Every 12-18 months, DIRI surveys/roadmaps are re-assessed and updated. New surveys may be conducted, dependent on Partner country progress.

Increasing Partner Capacity Build in Rule of Law Context: Effective security cooperation or related defense institution building within Security Sector Reform and Rule of Law programming requires sustained engagement with strategically important international partners. The Defense Institute of International Legal Studies (DIILS) serves as the Department's lead agency for providing professional legal seminars and programs, as well as education and training, to international military members and civilian government officials in furtherance of U.S. national security and foreign policy objectives.

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

In FY 2009, the DIILS is reimbursed under a number of broader programs. Direct funding to support strategic and operational priorities in accordance with the GEF and other national strategy directives was required to develop an effective long term strategy for rule of law programs across a broad spectrum of strategic countries. The DIILS' ability to develop long range plans tailored to particular security challenges and focused on a specific region or country is critical to the success of global stability. Funding also provides support for Department programs without the assessment of surcharges for infrastructure cost.

Funding in FY 2010 provides for the development and implementation of Rule of Law-based programs within each combatant command fulfilling the need for sustained engagement with regional and international partners that is necessary for the comprehensive implementation of long term defense institution building within security sector reform. It also addresses the challenges of doctrinally incorporating stability operations within persistent conflicts, with a focus on establishing effective partnerships in support of U.S. national interest and goals.

Global Train and Equip (Section 1206): This critical program represents a new approach to address current threats to national security. Because current threats often emanate from countries with which we are not at war, we must work through these partner countries to address threats before they develop into operations. This need becomes more acute in an environment of weak states, rapidly developing threats, and ungoverned areas that can be exploited for terrorist safe haven. Training and equipping foreign forces to address their own security problems is a military requirement to avoid future military interventions and mitigate long term risk. As Secretary Gates said, "Arguably the most important military component in [defeating terrorism] is not the fighting we do ourselves, but how well we enable and empower our partners to defend and govern their own

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

countries. The standing up and mentoring of indigenous armies and police - once the province of Special Forces - is now a key mission for the military as a whole."

Global Train and Equip programs are designed to meet time-sensitive and emerging threats and opportunities to build the capacity of partner-nation forces. The initiative enables the Secretary (with the concurrence of the Secretary of State) to expedite the training and equipping of partners, conducting programs that build the capacity of their national military forces to conduct counterterrorist operations, or to support military and stability operations in which U.S. armed forces are a participant. The initiative is timely, strategy-driven, integrated across diplomacy and defense, and measurable. Global Train and Equip programs are:

- Co-formulated, reviewed, and vetted by Defense and State, both by CoCOMs and Ambassadors in the field, and in Washington D.C.;
- Approved by the Secretaries of Defense and State;
- Notified to Congressional oversight committees;
- Compliant with Foreign Assistance Act (FAA) and Arms Export Control Act (AECA) security, end-use, and retransfer agreements; and
- Directed toward partner nations that uphold human rights, attendant fundamental freedoms, and the rule of law.

Illustrative training and equipment includes:

Training: counter-terrorism; air assault training and doctrine; civil-military operations; infrastructure security; intelligence analysis and sharing; maritime

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

operations, security, and interdiction; equipment maintenance; border security; and operator training.

Equipment: coastal surveillance stations; patrol boats; various spare and replacement parts; avionics and communications upgrades; small arms weapons; small/large caliber ammunition; radios; computers; night vision devices; riverine assault and combat support craft; and HMMWVs.

These programs allow CoCOMs and Ambassadors, working together, to train and equip foreign military forces in response to urgent and emergent threats and opportunities to solve problems before they become crises requiring major military interventions. By building the capacity of partners to handle their security problems, these effects reduce stress on U.S. forces. The Geographic CoCOMs consider global train and equip authority DoD's single most important tool to shape the environment and counter terrorism outside Iraq and Afghanistan.

Although the Global Train and Equip authority has been in effect just three years, it has rapidly become the gold standard for interagency cooperation to meet emerging threats and opportunities because of the revolutionary way it is managed. Unique program aspects include:

• Speed and Prevention. Traditional security assistance takes three to four years from concept to execution. Global Train and Equip authority can respond to urgent and emergent threats or opportunities in six months or less. For example, early successes included:

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

- o Enabled a rapid response to a resurgent Taliban threat by augmenting Pakistani air assault capability, resulting in an increased operations tempo and increased capture and kill rates.
- o Rapidly moved basic supplies like ammunition and truck spare parts that the Lebanese Army desperately needed to combat al-Qaeda affiliated terrorist groups in refugee camps, providing mobility that allowed it to maintain the offensive at the Nahr al Barid camp and ultimately stabilize the area.
- o Enabled rapid assistance for Nigeria to help enhance security in the Gulf of Guinea after Charles Taylor was captured and restrictions on assistance removed.
- Rigor. Thorough vetting of submissions results in strategically sound choices with a high national security return on investment. Proposals are competitively scored by the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), the Joint Staff, the DSCA, the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, and numerous Department of State components, with review by both regional and functional experts. The Departments of Defense and State must agree before programs go forward.
  - Planning requirements for Global Train and Equip program submissions far exceed those for other programs. The CoCOMs and U.S. Embassies must lay out detailed proposals that address the full range of issues that impact program success, including operations and maintenance plans, absorptive capacity and executability, adherence to broad foreign policy objectives, military feasibility, integration with other U.S. Government efforts, mitigation of human rights concerns, etc.
- Dual-Key Authority. The DoD and the Department of State coordinate on all security cooperation activities, but the Global Train and Equip authority takes

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

cooperation to a new level. It encourages joint formulation of programs between Embassies and CoCOMs, and both must approve each program. This brings the best competencies of both Departments to bear, including the diplomacy that is required to achieve buy-in from foreign partners.

Global Train and Equip represents an enduring military requirement to avoid large-scale military conflicts and reduce stress on U.S. forces. The DoD will continue to build on the success of this program in several ways. Metrics are under development to measure operational and strategic effects. The DoD has asked the Inspector General to do a three-year systemic review of Global Train and Equip programs and to make its own recommendations to improve program performance. When operations tempos allow, DoD will use U.S. forces in lieu of or with contractors to conduct or supervise training to improve the quality of training and to build military-to-military relationships. Finally, DoD will also integrate partners into combined exercise programs to periodically test their capabilities and assess how well these capabilities are maintained or improved over time.

Security & Stabilization Assistance (Section 1207): Security and Stabilization Assistance Authority ("Section 1207") allows DoD to provide funds to the Department of State to send civilians to implement stabilization missions - bringing civilian expertise to bear alongside our warfighters. Such support was designed to build the Department of State's civilian deployable capacity and thereby relieve pressure for U.S. military personnel to perform these missions. Section 1207 enables whole-of-government approaches to critical security challenges by authorizing DoD to support State-run security, stabilization, and reconstruction efforts in key countries. The 1207 program is built on a recognition that military solutions are not enough to address pressing security concerns and that fundamental social needs must be met to defuse underlying sources of instability. These

#### I. Description of Operations Financed: (continued)

projects are developed as State and DoD collaborations to complement parallel military efforts or to deflect the need for military involvement at all.

The Department of State and DoD have agreed to use this authority under "dual key" procedures similar to those used for executing the Global Train and Equip authority, which have become the standard for interagency cooperation. The appropriated amount is \$99,623 thousand in FY 2009. To meet the program needs and expansion to a wider set of government entities, DoD seeks to expand this program to \$197,090 thousand, and increase authority to \$200,000 thousand in FY 2010.

#### II. Force Structure Summary: N/A

FY 2009 Congressional Action

A. <u>BA</u>	Subactivities	FY 2008 Actuals	Budget Request	Amount	Percent	Appropriated	Current Estimate	FY 2010 Estimate
1.	Regional Centers	89,535	96,378	-219	2%	96,159	96,159	93,271
2.	Combating-Terrorism Fellowship Program	23,914	35,000	-132	4%	34,868	34,868	33,997
3.	Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace	24,688	30,000	-113	4%	29,887	29,887	29,789
4.	Canadian Environmental Cleanup	12,900	0			0	0	0
5.	Regional International Outreach	1,140	1,300	-5	0%	1,295	1,295	1,291
6.	Security Cooperation Training and Support	927	1,000	-4	0%	996	996	982
7.	Global Training and Equipment (1206)	271,637	500,000	-151,320	-30.3%	348,680	348,680	344,908
8.	Security & Stabilization Assistance (1207)	0	200,000	-100,377	-50.2%	99,623	99,623	197,090
9.	Consortium for Complex Operations	0	2,600	-7	3%	2,593	2,593	0
10.	DSCA Administrative Expense	10,081	13,746	-23	2%	13,723	13,723	12,949
11.	Defense Institution Reform Initiative							5,828
12.	Increasing Partner Capacity Building in Rule of Law Context							1,651
13.	FY 07 Coalition Support (X-Year)	460,097	0			0	0	0

FY 2009 Congressional Action

A. BA Subactivities	FY 2008 Actuals	Budget Request	Amount	Percent	Appropriated	Current Estimate	FY 2010 Estimate
14. FY 08 Bridge	618,816	0			0	0	0
Supplemental (X-Year)							
15. FY 08 Supplementals	300,000				0	0	0
Supplemental for Coalition	7,222						
Support Carryover							
Total	1,820,957	880,024	-252,200	-28.7%	627,824	627,824	721,756

- \* FY 2008 Actual column includes \$260,097 thousand of FY 2007 Coalition Support Fund (CSF)(X-year)(P.L. 109-289), \$200,000 thousand of FY 2007 CSF (X-Year) (P.L. 110-28), \$300,000 thousand of FY 2008 Bridge Supplemental (X-year)(P.L. 110-161), \$318,816 thousand of FY 2008 Supplemental (X-Year) (P.L. 110-252), \$100,000 thousand of FY 2008 Bridge Supplemental, Lift and Sustain (P.L. 110-161), \$200,000 thousand of FY 2008 Supplemental, Lift and Sustain (P.L. 110-252) and \$7,222 thousand of Supplemental for Coalition Support (X-year) prior year unobligated balance carryover.
- \* FY 2009 column excludes \$1,730,000 thousand for FY 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations (\$1,250,000 thousand of FY 2009 Coalition Support Funds (\$200,000 included in FY 2009 Bridge Supplemental), \$450,000 thousand of FY 2009 Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan) (\$100,000 thousand included in FY 2009 Bridge Supplemental), and \$30,000 thousand FY 2009 Kyrgyz Republic) and \$528,517 thousand Supplemental for Coalition Support (X-year) prior year unobligated balance carryover.
- \* FY 2010 column excludes \$1,950,000 thousand for FY 2010 Overseas Contingency Operations (\$1,550,000 thousand of FY 2010 Coalition Support Funds, and \$400,000 thousand of FY 2010 Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan).

B. Reconciliation Summary	Change FY 2009/FY 2009	Change FY 2009/FY 2010
Baseline Funding	880,024	627,824
Congressional Adjustments (Distributed)	-250,000	
Congressional Adjustments (Undistributed)		
Adjustments to Meet Congressional Intent		
Congressional Adjustments (General Provisions)	-1,795	
Congressional Earmark	-405	
Subtotal Appropriated Amount	627,824	627,824
FY 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations	1,730,000	1,950,000
Supplemental for Coalition Support Prior Year Carryover	528,517	
Subtotal Baseline Funding	2,886,341	2,577,824
Anticipated Supplemental		
Reprogrammings for Fact-of-Life Changes		
Price Changes		9,924
Functional Transfers		
Program Changes		84,008
Current Estimate	2,886,341	2,671,756
Less: Wartime Supplemental	-2,258,517	-1,950,000
Normalized Current Estimate	627,824	721,756

C. Reconciliation of Increases and Decreases	Amount	<u>Totals</u>
FY 2009 President's Budget Request (Amended, if applicable)		880,024
1. Congressional Adjustments		-252,200
a. Distributed Adjustments	-250,000	
b. Undistributed Adjustments		
c. Adjustments to meet Congressional Intent		
d. General Provisions - Sec 8101 - Economic Assumptions	-1,795	
e. Congressional Earmarks - Indian Lands Environmental Impact	-405	
FY 2009 Appropriated Amount		627,824
2. War-Related Supplemental Appropriations		2,258,517
a. Coalition Support Funds	1,250,000	
b. Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan)	450,000	
c. Kyrgyz Republic	30,000	
d. Supplemental for Coalition Support Carryover	528,517	
3. Fact of Life Changes		
FY 2009 Baseline Funding		2,886,341
4. Reprogrammings (requiring 1415 Actions)		
Revised FY 2009 Estimate		2,886,341
5. Less: Item 2, War-Related Supplemental Appropriations		-2,258,517
FY 2009 Normalized Current Estimate		627,824
6. Price Change		9,924
7. Functional Transfers		
8. Program Increases		103,751
a. Annualization of New FY 2009 Program		
b. One-Time FY 2010 Increases		
c. Program Growth in FY 2010		

C. Reco	nciliation of Increases and Decreases	Amount	Totals
1)			
	increase will provide for development, reconstruction and		
	civilian capacity building for complex security and stabilization challenges. Funds will be executed in other		
	intra-governmental purchases, \$+96,272 thousand. (FY 2009		
	baseline: \$99,623 thousand)	96,272	
2)	Defense Institution Reform Initiative (DIRI): Funding	•	
	provides for the requirements/determination phase of the		
	DIRI process that develops partner tools to manage,		
	sustain and employ capabilities developed through U.S.		
	security cooperation programs. Funds will be executed in other intra-governmental purchases, \$+5,913 thousand. A		
	decrease of \$-85 thousand in management and professional		
	support services is result of a DoD initiative to improve		
	oversight, acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor		
	services. (FY 2009 baseline: \$0)	5,828	
3)			
	Context: Funding provides for the development and		
	implementation of Rule of Law-based programs and enables		
	the Defense Institute of International Legal Studies (DIILS) to put on additional programs without applying a		
	surcharge for infrastructure. Funds will be executed in		
	other intra-governmental purchases, \$+1,672 thousand. A		
	decrease of \$-21 thousand in management and professional		
	support services is result of a DoD initiative to improve		
	oversight, acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor		
	services. (FY 2009 baseline: \$0)	1,651	
_	ram Decreases		-19,743
	nualization of FY 2009 Program Decreases		
b.On	e-Time FY 2009 Increases		

C. F	Recor	nciliation of Increases and Decreases	Amount	<u>Totals</u>
d	.Pro	ogram Decreases in FY 2010		·
	1)	Consortium for Complex Operations: The decrease is due to		
		a functional transfer of the program to National Defense		
		University. (FY 2009 baseline \$2,593 thousand)	-2,632	
	2)	Regional Centers: Courses, seminars and workshops will		
		not be held; other contracts \$-6,860 thousands and \$+308		
		in other intra-government purchases services. Also, a		
		decrease of \$-711 thousand in management and professional		
		support services is result of a DoD initiative to improve oversight, acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor		
		services. An increase of \$+954 thousand in civilian pay		
		will be used to fund mandatory salary increase under the		
		National Security Personnel System (NSPS). (FY 2009		
		baseline: \$96,159 thousand)	-6,309	
	3)	DSCA Administrative Operations: A decrease of \$-40		
		thousand in management and professional support services		
		is result of a DoD initiative to improve oversight,		
		acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor services. A		
		decrease of \$-1,889 thousand is reflected in contracts		
		\$-1,880 thousand and \$-9 thousand in other		
		intergovernmental purchases to cover one-time costs		
		associated with the planning and design of a new DSCA headquarters facility that meets anti-terrorism and force		
		protection standards mandated by DoD. An increase of		
		\$+876 thousand in civilian pay will be used to replace		
		approximately nine contractors with government employees		
		as a part of the DoD contractor in-sourcing initiative.		
		(FY 2009 baseline: \$13,723 thousand)	-1,053	

C. Reco	nciliation of Increases and Decreases	Amount	<u>Totals</u>
4)	Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP): Key		
	courses will not be offered; \$-795 thousand in other		
	intra-government purchases services. A decrease of \$-494		
	thousand in management and professional support services		
	is result of a DoD initiative to improve oversight,		
	acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor services. (FY		
	2009 baseline: \$34,868 thousand)	-1,289	
5)	Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace (PfP)		
	(WIF/PfP): A decrease of \$-433 thousand in management		
	and professional support services is result of a DoD		
	initiative to improve oversight, acquisition and in-		
	sourcing of contractor services. The size and scope of WIF		
	programs will be reduced; \$-24 thousand in other		
	contracts. (FY 2009 baseline \$29,887 thousand)	-457	
6)	Regional International Outreach: A decrease of		
	\$-20 thousand in management and professional support		
	services is result of a DoD initiative to improve		
	oversight, acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor		
	services. (FY 2009 baseline: \$1,295 thousand)	-20	
7)	Security Cooperation Training and Support: A decrease of		
	\$-14 thousand in management and professional support		
	services is result of a DoD initiative to improve		
	oversight, acquisition and in-sourcing of contractor		
	services. Training and support will be reduced; \$-12		
	thousand in other contracts. (FY 2009 baseline: \$996		
	thousand)	-26	
8)	Global Training and Equip (Section 1206): The size and		
	scope of Global Training and Equip programs will be		
	reduced; \$-7,957 thousand in other intra-governmental		
	purchases. (FY 2009 baseline: \$348,681 thousand)	-7,957	
FY 2010	Budget Request		721 <b>,</b> 756
			DSCA 412

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

The Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) provides program management and program implementation support for the Regional Centers for Security Studies, Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace (WIF/PfP) program, Combating-Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP) and the Regional International Outreach program.

The DSCA's performance measures support implementation of DoD's GEF and COCOMs' Theater Security Cooperation Strategies. By focusing on coalition and alliance requirements, training and education of personnel from allied and friendly nations, and various DoD programs that support access and interoperability, DSCA helps to effectively link DoD's strategic direction with those of allies and friendly nations.

#### Regional Centers for Security Studies

As one of the Department's primary assets for regional outreach and network building efforts among U.S. and foreign military, civilian and non-governmental leaders, the Regional Centers serve as focal points for DoD strategic communications, including strategic listening efforts, and they are key to the DoD efforts to build partner institutional capacity and operations capabilities—notably by enhancing the intellectual capacity of current and future leaders to address security challenges.

The Regional Centers' activities included a core of resident programs, in-region engagement programs and outreach programs for former participants, as well as an increasing permanent in-region presence. In FY 2008, these programs reached over 9,359 participants. The feedback from participants is that Regional Center programs help to dispel misperceptions and negative stereotypes about America and Americans while providing strategic insights.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

#### Resident Programs

In FY 2008, the resident programs focused on transnational threats, such as terrorism and capacity-building for security, stability, transition and reconstruction. Each Regional Center met unique regional challenges. Initiatives were tailored to build and sustain enduring partner capabilities and relationships among leaders, attract opinion shapers, facilitate interagency and regional communication and collaboration, and articulate U.S. policies and actions in their proper context. Each resident program exposes participants to an academic-style learning environment and provides an American cultural experience, giving participants an opportunity to build ties with U.S. and regional counterparts.

New initiatives that started in FY 2008 at the George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies (GCMC) include a Security, Stability, Transition and Reconstruction Course; Homeland Defense Course; and efforts to educate Palestinian Authority representatives in selected resident programs producing strategic listening reports for DoD senior leaders. The Near East South Asia Center (NESA), the Africa Center for Strategic Studies (ACSS), the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies (CHDS) and the Asia Pacific Center (APCSS) continue to respond to Combatant Commander and country team requests for increased orientation courses that provide regional understanding to incoming Combatant Command and U.S. Embassy staff officers. During FY 2008, the Regional Centers launched a new initiative at the request of the U.S. House of Representatives Democracy Assistance The APCSS collaborated with the HDAC to develop and conduct a Commission (HDAC). workshop for a delegation of Indonesian and Mongolian parliamentarians in less than three The HDAC declared the workshop immensely successful, with the parliamentarians identifying key issues in security sector governance requiring urgent attention in their nations, and gaining significant insights on potential ways in which to do so through their interactions in Washington, D.C. Upon their return to Jakarta, parliamentarians met with U.S. Embassy representatives and registered their satisfaction.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

The NESA Center also partnered with HDAC and conducted a workshop on Afghanistan and Lebanon. One of the most important efforts to build partner capacity was the NESA Center initiative to respond to White House and OSD requests by teaming with the Marshall Center to provide an Afghanistan-Pakistan confidence building workshop, a counter-terrorism legal workshop, an Afghanistan elections workshop, and a quickly organized program for Lebanese security leaders. Each initiative provides DoD, Department of State, and regional leaders with unique insights into the concerns of their U.S. and regional counterparts, and expands their knowledge of differing approaches to address key security challenges.

ACSS resident programs for senior and mid-level military and government security practitioners continue to increase network-building and invigorate the foundation for strategic listening. The ACSS conducted timely topical programs such as the African Defense Attaché Seminar, which was widely recognized by country team leadership for integrating efforts to acquaint African embassy personnel with the structures and workings of the U.S. government, and with U.S. security policies and programs pertaining to Africa.

#### In-Region Programs

The Regional Centers in-region program priorities expand and derive benefit from relationships with former participants, thus creating valuable bonds with key influencers and future leaders. The Regional Centers significantly advance U.S. efforts by integrating former participants who understand U.S. security objectives into capacity-building programs. The Regional Centers create efficiencies by leveraging in-region programs and visits to host meetings with former participants. Country team and Combatant Command leaders identify alumni programs as having a positive impact on partner and regional dynamics. Participants in several regions are developing security

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

strategies that align with U.S. policy objectives in areas such as counterterrorism. Partner nations are increasing their openness to whole-of-government approaches to security challenges. Regional cooperation is increasing, particularly with respect to mitigating the effects and responding more effectively to transnational threats, including terrorism, health and environmental challenges, and natural disasters. Inregion programs include:

- ACSS conducted over 20 Topical Outreach Program (TOP) events across the African continent. The events are developed from security-related discussions started during the resident programs to keep former participants informed on U.S. government and DoD security policy objectives. ACSS alumni communities provide the Africa Command (AFRICOM) with multiple opportunities for regional engagement. Other federal agencies and DOD elements have recently expressed interest in joining the TOP effort.
- APCSS conducted a seminar in Vietnam that enhances Vietnam's preparedness for its United Nations Security Council (UNSC) non-permanent membership role. APCSS conducted a workshop and exercise in Indonesia on the interagency process, which impelled the Indonesian president to form an advisory council to support decision-making on transnational threats. The APCSS also instituted new bilateral and multilateral seminars on topics such as managing borders in the maritime domain (Malaysia); energy security cooperation in the Asia-Pacific; democratic control of the security forces workshop with Nepal; and a disaster management workshop in Brunei.
- CHDS held workshops for new and emerging democratic governments in Central America and the Caribbean. These programs contribute greatly to building institutional capacity by enhancing senior leaders' understanding of international norms and conventions on terrorism, and on drafting national counterterrorism strategies that

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

support U.S. goals. In response to an invitation from the Bolivian Ministry of Defense in U.S. and Bolivian relations, CHDS conducted a defense and security symposium, involving nearly 40 Bolivian cabinet members and advisors and senior defense strategists. The country team was provided unprecedented access to Bolivian leadership. Other examples of successes in building partner capacity include: The government of Canada invited CHDS to evaluate their engagement in the Western Hemisphere; CHDS assisted the Government of Colombia in restructuring its police and military education programs; CHDS conducted a four-day National Security Strategy (NSS) Development Seminar in Guatemala to support a U.S. embassy commitment to the President. The embassy assessed that this event built a relationship with security professionals likely to remain into the next government--and will lead to the conduct of a National Security Planning Workshop (NSPW) at the Presidential/Cabinet level with the next administration.

• GCMC increased its responsiveness to CoCOMs, OSD, partner governments and alumni to build partner capabilities and capacity by conducting tailored seminars, including: Azerbaijan Bilateral Defense Consultation; Macedonian Parliamentary Tutorial; Slovenia Mobile Strategic Education Course; Ukraine Euro-Atlantic Integration Tutorial; Montenegro Seminar in Defense Institution Building; and Tajikistan Civil Military Response to Terrorism Seminar. Notably, GCMC assisted Kazakhstan in developing a new National Military Strategy, a required element of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Individual Partnership Action Plan. An unusual acknowledgement of their value was highlighted in a letter from the President and Chief Executive of AMTRAK to ASD McHale. It expressed appreciation for the Marshall Center's support toward establishing an international working group to foster cooperation and share lessons learned in the areas of critical infrastructure protection, combating terrorism, and passenger rail safety.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

• NESA Senior Executive Seminar participants were very interested in the structure and process of U.S. decision-making and obtain a genuine appreciation for the many ongoing debates in American society, both inside and outside the government. For example, while participants criticized the U.S. "democracy agenda", they recognized and were impressed that, at home, America actually "does" democracy. The NESA Center routinely served a critical strategic listening function by communicating partner perceptions and observations to senior DoD leadership.

In-region presence supports the Centers' strategic communications and alumni-based network building to influence current and future leaders (academics, key civil representatives of international and non-governmental organizations, and private sector entities) in support of U.S. Government and DoD security objectives. The most aggressive initiative to engage in strategic listening and network building is the effort by the Regional Centers to establish forward offices. ACSS established a permanent footprint in East Africa in FY 2007 and is in the final stages of establishing a West Africa annex in Dakar, Senegal in FY 2009. The NESA has also taken required steps to establish a forward presence in the Middle East.

The Regional Centers continue to develop and execute initiatives while partnering with foreign war colleges and civilian universities, developing new relationships to support strategic communications in the region. Two of the most visible initiatives to integrate efforts to leverage capabilities with strategic partner capacity building are the APCSS Trend Analysis Program which serves as a catalyst for a community of experts interested in improving understanding of disaster management and its relationship to governance and human security, and the NESA Regional Network of Strategic Studies Centers which was recognized by the Central Command (CENTCOM) staff as having had a force-multiplier effect in developing channels of communication among defense and foreign affairs-related think tanks across the NESA region.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

As the Regional Centers continue to attract current and future regional leaders, opportunities for strategic engagement have continued to be identified by OSD and Combatant Commands as well as articulated in the Guidance for Employment of the Force. The challenge for the Regional Centers is to continue to be responsive to new opportunities; to build communities of influence with regional leadership while accommodating required growth in staff and faculty.

In FY 2009-2010, the Regional Centers will continue to leverage resources to develop and execute new initiatives to build partner institutional capacity and enhance the intellectual capacity of current and future leaders. Specifically, the Regional Centers will increase outreach offerings to varying degrees, including in-region courses, conferences, workshops, seminars, and activities with former participants. Curricula will continue to be tailored using regional expertise to respond more effectively to Combatant Commands and OSD requirements. Future NESA and ACSS forward presence (on the Arabian Peninsula and in West Africa) will help maintain the Regional Centers' currency on issues important to regional leaders and develop the personal relationships so important to maintaining regional communications. The Regional Centers will increase their use of communication tools (multimedia, distance learning, newsletters, e-bulletins, and webcasts) to synchronize outreach efforts and reach a larger audience in less time. Specific increases include:

o ACSS will continue core In-residence Programs, including: one iteration of Senior Leader Seminar (2 weeks, 110 participants, in D.C. or in-region); two iterations of Next Generation of African Military Leaders Course (4 weeks, 55 military participants); one iterations of Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) Support Program; two iterations of African Defense Attaché Course (1 week, 40 participants); three iterations of Introduction to African Security Issues

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

- (1 week, 40 mid-level U.S. government participants). ACSS would also fund additional in-region annexes in west and South Africa.
- o APCSS planned increases allows the Center to offer four Executive Courses (6 weeks, 55 Participants per course); three Senior Executive Courses (1 week, 25 Participants per course); three Comprehensive Security Responses to Terrorism Courses (3 weeks, 50 Participants per course); three Comprehensive Crisis Response Course (4 weeks, 30 Participants per course); and four Junior Executive Courses (4 weeks, 25 Participants per course).
- o CHDS will expand its programs from 17 to more than 45 events per year, and accommodate inflation for selected increases in programs, staff, and faculty. Core In-residence Programs will include additional participants and iterations include: Strategy and Defense Policy (SDP) (2 x 3 weeks, 36-72 executive level participants); Senior Executive Dialogue (1 week); Interagency Coordination and Combating Terrorism course (ICCT) (3 weeks); Advanced Defense Policy (ADP) course (3-5 weeks distance learning module followed by 3 weeks in residence for top participants only). CHDS will increase in-region programs such as: National Security Planning Workshops: (1 and 1/2 day, four times annually); Advanced Policy-making Seminars (3 days in conjunction with other programs); Sub-Regional Conferences (3 days): Nation Lab computer-assisted educational outreach program (up to seven iterations per year of this event); and, Faculty Outreach Events (one or two CHDS personnel travel to a country and present thematic programs (seminars, panels, workshops) to one primary and up to three secondary institutions in the local government and NGO arena).
- o GCMC funding will ensure GCMC is able to maintain at least that number of participants through the same programs and events in FY 2010 while also maintaining all of its 2008 capacity. The core programs are: three iterations of Program in Advanced Security Studies (12 weeks, 80 participants, taught in English, German, and

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

Russian); three iterations of Program on Terrorism and Security Studies (5 weeks, 60 participants); two iterations of Senior Executive Seminar (2 weeks, 60 participants); two iterations of Security, Stability, Transition Reconstruction Course (SSTAR) (3 weeks, 45 participants); two iterations of Seminar on Transatlantic Cooperation and Security (STACS) (3 weeks, 45 participants). Accelerate efforts to ensure that outreach contributions to Combatant Command security cooperation objectives produce benefits from the extensive alumni network to aid in planning, developing, executing, and assessing these programs and activities. Specifically: GCMC takes modules of the resident Program on Terrorism and Security Studies, to include a module on Countering Ideological Support to Terrorism, into the AOR (objective is ten per year); increase Graduate Support Activities - objective is to contract for three alumni conferences per year.

o NESA funding will be used to build influence in the NESA region by increasing programs and standing up a presence in the region. Increases in programs and iterations, will result in the increase from 250-450 participants attending core inresidence Programs, including: Executive Seminars (3 weeks, 37 participants); Senior Executive Seminar (8 days, 23 participants); Counter-Terrorism Seminars (2 weeks, 25 participants); Topical Seminars (1-3 days, 30 participants). Funding increases through the this period will continue new initiatives in the areas of health security 30 participants), women's roles in national security (1 week. 30 participants), strategic listening in support of U.S. GWOT strategy (1-3 days, 30-45 participants), topical workshops (1-3 days, 30 participants), and augment the activities of the Regional Network of Strategic Studies Centers. This budget also provides estimated funding for the support costs and initial manning of a forward NESA center (in region) for 3-5 personnel. Additional funding will also support new sustainment and outreach activities, including executive and senior executive alumni symposia, and more effective outreach in Washington.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

Warsaw Initiative Fund/Partnership for Peace (WIF/PfP) Program

The Warsaw Initiative Fund (WIF) is DoD's primary instrument to support developing North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)/Partnership for Peace (PfP) member nations. The WIF program is focused on defense institution reform, enhancing U.S./NATO-PfP Partner interoperability, and supporting PfP Partners integration with NATO. Through WIF, DoD is able to respond quickly as opportunities emerge to encourage PfP countries to reform defense institutions or develop specific capabilities.

The WIF Defense Institution Building (DIB) program is an important tool that allows PfP-member countries to be candid about present conditions and recognize the need for reform. WIF surveys have been completed for eleven PfP-partners in the Western Balkans, Black Sea, and Caucasus regions. These surveys provide the DoD with a comprehensive assessment of the situation in partner defense institutions and enables DoD and DSCA to develop a thorough way-ahead document, the DIB Roadmap. DIB roadmaps provide a step-by-step building block approach to conducting comprehensive defense reform programs over a multi-year timeframe. Roadmaps will have been completed for ten PfP Partners in FY 2008.

In FY 2008, WIF resources were used to conduct activities with 17 developing PfP nations. WIF funded activities included but were not limited to, conferences supporting defense reform activities, defense institution building (DIB) workshops, functional seminars that aid in the development of niche capabilities of Civil and Military emergency preparedness, and PfP Partner participation in 25 military exercises with objectives ranging from practicing and performing operational and tactical planning to reinforcing principles of democratic control of the armed forces. During FY 2008, there were a total of 34 exercises and 228 conferences/seminars/workshops conducted.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

WIF accomplishments with Ukraine, Azerbaijan, Serbia, and Kazakhstan in FY 2008 are of In Ukraine, the development of a Joint Operational Command particular note. headquarters, based entirely on NATO structural models and doctrinal procedures, has accelerated the reform of the General Staff along Western organizational lines. In Azerbaijan, the creation of a common set of operational concepts between the Navy and Coast Guard has extended coordinated surveillance and response capabilities in the While Serbia has halted cooperation with NATO, bilateral efforts at reforming the Ministry of Defense and General Staff have continued. In Kazakhstan, a WIF team is helping to shape the curriculum and content of the National Defense University, which will shape generations of future military leaders. FY 2008 also saw the final development of plans to initiate the Balkans TTX Civil Military Emergency Preparedness (CMEP) disaster exercise that will include eight WIF countries, NATO, and various international organizations and non-governmental organizations. The A3 countries of Albania, Croatia and Macedonia participated in LOGEX 07, an exercise that trained their logistics staff in the deployment, reception staging onward movement, sustainment and redeployment in support of NATO requirements.

WIF will continue to focus on targeting key defense reform requirements (and deficiencies) in PfP countries utilizing DIB roadmaps, and will push to expand the DIB process into Central Asia. WIF will provide assistance to PfP countries accordingly to build partnership capacity and increase participation in coalition operations. WIF resources will be used to assist PfP nations in meeting U.S. priority NATO partnership goals identified in NATO Membership Action Plans (MAPs) and Individual Partnership Action Plans (IPAPs). The following number of exercises, conferences/seminars/workshops are planned in FY 2009-2010:

- FY 2009: 36 exercises and 334 conferences/seminars/workshops
- FY 2010: 34 exercises and 345 conferences/seminars/workshops

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

#### Combating-Terrorism Fellowship Program

The Combating Terrorism Fellowship Program (CTFP) continues to engage, through education and training, foreign combating terrorism (CbT) military officers and security officials. This unique DoD program focuses on capacity building of partners and allies at the operational and strategic levels, and provides specialized programs to address individual country and regional needs.

In FY 2008, approximately 2,400 foreign military and security officials attended CTFP-funded programs. The CTFP provided approximately 500 educational programs, including 45 events in 32 foreign countries in all six Regional Combatant Commands. This included CbT education and training support to emerging regional and sub-regional organizations and alliances.

The program broadened its outreach by engaging countries who had not previously been engaged in this DoD program. Concomitantly, the program further narrowed the types of CTFP-funded education and training events in order to focus on specific combating terrorism education and training engagements for operational and strategic government officials – both military and civilian.

The program's challenge was the timeliness of completing human rights vetting particularly for mobile education training events (METs). This has led to the cancellation and/or postponement of numerous training events this year.

In FY 2009, CTFP will continue to be a valuable DoD partnership strategy tool that will continue to fill a crucial void in U.S. efforts to provide targeted international combating terrorism education to our partners. Combating terrorism education and training programs have proven to be an effective strategic tool in the war on terrorism

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

that supplements the efforts of Geographic CoCOMs in accomplishing their missions. FY 2009, CTFP has been authorized to \$35,000 thousand. This proposed amendment to section 2249c of Title 10, United States Code, which authorizes the CTFP, is intended to define and describe the focus areas of the program when the 2007 NDAA authorized the name changed from the "Counter Terrorism" Fellowship Program to the "Combating Terrorism" Fellowship Program. This name change was recognition that the efforts to defeat terrorism must include counter-terrorism and anti-terrorism activities, as well as homeland defense and border control. This increase will address an education and training gap that the Department has identified in areas related to reducing partners' vulnerabilities to extremism or terrorist acts. This increase will also contribute to the Department's efforts to help partner nations control and secure ungoverned spaces and border areas by developing education and training venues tailored to address such threats, while increasing existing training programs focused on the entire spectrum of combating terrorism activities. In FY 2009, with the additional \$10,000 thousand, it is anticipated that approximately 2,800 to 3,000 foreign military and security officials will attend CTFP-funded programs and provide approximately 500 educational programs to include ~50 events in ~35 foreign countries in all Regional Combatant Commands. should include CbT education and training support to emerging regional and sub-regional organizations and alliances.

In FY 2010, CTFP as a valuable DoD partnership strategy tool will continue to support U.S. efforts to provide targeted international combating terrorism education to our partners. Combating terrorism education and training programs have proven to be an effective strategic tool in the war on terrorism that supplements the efforts of Geographic CoCOMs in accomplishing their missions. The program's plan and objectives for FY 2010 will be to maintain and build upon the efforts and initiatives of FY 2009 as well as the continued efforts to conduct continuing education outreach to previous participants in the program. In FY 2010, as anticipated in FY 09, the additional \$10,000

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

thousand should support approximately 2,800 to 3,000 foreign military and security officials to attend CTFP-funded programs and provide approximately 500 educational programs to include ~50 events in ~35 foreign countries in all six Regional Combatant Commands. This should continue to include CbT education and training support to emerging regional and sub-regional organizations and alliances.

#### Regional International Outreach Program

The Regional International Outreach (RIO) Suite of Capabilities continued development efforts of Spiral #3 during FY 2008. User validation/verification and testing of Spiral #3 was conducted also conducted in FY 2008. The RIO is federating over ten instances (nodes) of the underlying technology, tying together the Regional Centers for Security Studies and other institutions as directed, allowing the sharing of data in an enterprise environment. Security accreditation process continues in order to obtain Mission Assurance Category (MAC) Level 3, Common Criteria EAL-2, and Federal Information Process Standards (FIPS) 140-2 compliance. The Capabilities Development Document (CDD), was briefed to the Net Centric Functional Control Board Working Group. The Capabilities Production Document (CPD), and Information Support Plan (ISP) required for Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) process are in process.

Spiral #3 underwent developmental and operational testing in October and November 2007. User validation/verification and testing of Spiral #3 was conducted and the security accreditation process completed. In August/September 2008, the RIO suite will be upgraded with required hardware and software at the Naval Postgraduate School and on site security accreditation will be conducted. Additional DoD educational organizations (Defense Institute of International Legal Studies, Defense Language Institute - English Language Center, and the National Defense University School for National Security Executive Education) were added and integrated into the RIO Suite of Capabilities.

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

Information sharing between RIO, student management systems and the Defense Security Assistance Management System is being planned (FY 09/10) in order to have like data and reduce data entry and errors. Finally, plans are under way to incorporate other entities that are using the underlying technology, such as Joint Knowledge Online (JKO), in the federation further expanding the content available and user community.

In FY 2009, RIO will conduct testing of the latest version which federates the various nodes allowing for the sharing of content and users throughout the member sites. RIO will update the suite with new software releases to include Advanced Distributed Learning (ADL), Content Management System (CMS), and internal/external interfaces, as well as the ability to allow for ad hoc query reporting, an automated toolset that supports creation and configuration management of the collaboration platform, and an update to the chat client. RIO will update security accreditation and the Joint Staff's Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) documentation. On-site support will continue at a number of the educational institutions to facilitate the implementation of the federated capability, refine requirements, and act as the consultant between developers and users. Funding will continue to support the operations and maintenance of the infrastructure based at the Naval Postgraduate School, and the test facility at SPAWAR Charleston.

In FY 2010, the RIO program will conduct testing of the latest development efforts and improvements to the platform's capabilities. The suite will be upgraded with new software that will assist with the management of user generated data, such as surveys and polls, as well as with the tracking of information sharing and collaborations trends, social network dynamics, and content exchange across domain boundaries. An update to the security accreditation package will be made, reflecting new and updated software capabilities as well as newly integrated educational organizations. The JCIDS documentation will be updated. On-site support will transition to a small team of

#### IV. Performance Criteria and Evaluation Summary

support specialists capable of deploying globally in support of new educational institutions that are brought into the federation, as well as continued support to the established educational institutions by site visits and event support. As the Department continues to expand the use of the technology to additional educational institutions, there will be a greater emphasis on support to these schools. Plans call for the expansion to the War Colleges, and other senior level educational schools/forums. Operations and maintenance will continue on the production and test servers at their respective locations.

				FY 2008/	FY 2009/
V. Personnel Summary	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2009	FY 2010
Active Military End Strength (E/S)					
(Total)	105	126	127	21	1
Officer	80	101	102	21	1
Enlisted	25	25	25	0	0
Civilian End Strength (Total)	414	486	476	72	-10
U.S. Direct Hire	384	461	451	77	-10
Total Direct Hire	384	461	451	77	-10
Foreign National Indirect Hire	30	25	25	-5	0
Memo: Reimbursable Civilians Included	13	14	19	1	5
Civilian FTEs (Total)	391	475	483	84	8
U.S. Direct Hire	361	450	458	89	8
Total Direct Hire	361	450	458	89	8
Foreign National Indirect Hire	30	25	25	-5	0
Memo: Reimbursable Civilians Included	12	12	19	0	7
Avg Annual Civ Salary (\$ in thousands)	110	111	119	1	8

#### VI. OP 32 Line Items as Applicable (Dollars in thousands):

			Change				Change		
		FY	2008/FY	2009		FY	2009/FY 2	<u> 2010</u>	
	FY 2008	FCF	Price	Program	FY 2009	FCF	Price	Program	FY 2010
OP 32 Line	Program	Diff	Growth	Growth	Program	Diff	Growth	Growth	Program
101 Exec&Spec Sched	38,278	0	1,455	6,967	46,700	0	1,156	1,830	49,686
103 Trav of Persons	22,688	15	454	7,392	30,549	15	367	0	30,931
673 DFAS	983	0	-51	0	932	0	0	0	932
771 Comm Transp	382	7	8	0	397	7	5	0	409
901 FN Indir Hires	3,723	923	114	0	4,760	920	117	0	5,797
912 GSA Leases	1,045	0	26	774	1,845	0	46	0	1,891
914 Purchased Comm	578	0	12	0	590	0	7	0	597
915 Rents (non GSA)	2,078	0	42	0	2,120	0	26	0	2,146
920 Supplies/Matl	2,047	15	41	0	2,103	14	25	0	2,142
921 Print & Repr	128	1	3	0	132	1	2	0	135
923 Fac Maint Cont	348	0	7	0	355	0	4	0	359
925 Equip Purch NF	1,439	0	29	0	1,468	0	18	0	1,486
932 Mgt Prof Supt Svcs	23,550	0	417	0	24,021	0	289	-1,818	22,492
987 Other Intra Govt Purch	1,699,298	0	33,702	-1,243,540	489,460	0	5,874	85,153	580,486
989 Other Contracts	24,392	767	488	-3,254	22,393	762	269	-1,157	22,267
999 Total Other Purchases	1,820,957	1,728	36,798	-1,231,659	627,824	1,719	8,205	84,008	721,756

<sup>\*</sup> FY 2008 Actual column includes \$260,097 thousand of FY 2007 Coalition Support Fund (CSF)(X-year)(P.L. 109-289), \$200,000 thousand of FY 2007 CSF (X-Year) (P.L. 110-28), \$300,000 thousand of FY 2008 Bridge Supplemental (X-year)(P.L. 110-161), \$318,816 thousand of FY 2008 Supplemental (X-Year) (P.L. 110-252), \$100,000 thousand of FY 2008 Bridge Supplemental, Lift and Sustain (P.L. 110-161), \$200,000 thousand of FY 2008 Supplemental, Lift and Sustain (P.L. 110-252) and \$7,222 thousand of Supplemental for Coalition Support (X-year) prior year unobligated balance carryover.

<sup>\*</sup> FY 2009 column excludes \$1,730,000 thousand for FY 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations (\$1,250,000 thousand of FY 2009 Coalition Support Funds (\$200,000 included in FY 2009 Bridge Supplemental), \$450,000 thousand of FY 2009 Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan) 0(\$100,000 thousand included in FY 2009 Bridge Supplemental), and \$30,000 thousand FY 2009 Kyrgyz Republic) and \$528,517 thousand Supplemental for Coalition Support (X-year) prior year unobligated balance carryover.

<sup>\*</sup> FY 2010 column <u>excludes</u> \$1,950,000 thousand for FY 2010 Overseas Contingency Operations (\$1,550,000 thousand of FY 2010 Coalition Support Funds, and \$400,000 thousand of FY 2010 Lift and Sustain (Iraq and Afghanistan).