
Security Cooperation Training Initiative

Training Our Security Cooperation Workforce For the Challenges of Today

By
Gregory W. Sutton

Director of Research, Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management

By now, many of you may be well aware that the training of the Department of Defense's (DOD's) security cooperation and security assistance workforce has drawn attention at the highest levels of the U.S. Government (USG). A Memorandum from the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget (OMB), to all USG Departments and Agencies stated in part.

Over the next several months, OMB will work with Congress, interagency management councils, experts in Federal management policy, Federal employees, and other key stakeholders to craft a broad management and performance framework that will achieve near term priorities and overcome long standing management challenges. This effort will include addressing the high-priority performance goals discussed below and will help inform budget decisions.

DOD choose several high-priority performance goals, one of which included training of the security cooperation (SC) and security assistance (SA) work force. The goal is to ensure that 95% of that workforce achieves and maintains an appropriate level of training not later than September 30, 2011. We will measure, track, and report progress to OMB each calendar quarter. The Defense Security Cooperation Agency (DSCA) Director has established an intermediate goal of achieving the 95% goal for our overseas personnel by the end of this fiscal year – September 2010. DOD addressed the broader sense of the effort to OMB in their memorandum.

The ability to strengthen and expand alliances and partnerships is a key goal for achieving the objectives established by the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) in the *2008 National Defense Strategy*, which is the point of departure for the ongoing *Quadrennial Defense Review*. An important element of strengthening partnerships is assisting other countries in improving their capabilities through U.S. Security Cooperation programs. The importance of strong partnerships has come into clearer focus in today's operational environment, where there is a highlighted need for trained personnel in U.S. Security Cooperation Organizations (SCO) located in each country abroad. SC, which includes DOD-administered SA programs, is an important tool of national security and foreign policy, and is an integral element of the DOD mission.

There are 107 SCOs worldwide, totaling approximately 670 personnel (U.S. military, U.S. civilian, and U.S.-hired foreign-service nationals) [editor's note: this number includes only those personnel directly funded by foreign military sales and foreign military financing (FMS/FMF) funds and by no means should be construed to be the total personnel involved overseas in SC/SA efforts]. Not all SCO personnel have received formal training in their SC duties and responsibilities. This often results in less than optimal and timely provision of assistance to partner countries. A priority for the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy [USD(P)] and the DSCA is increasing the

training of SCO personnel. A well-qualified and responsive SC workforce is often the face of the USG in many countries, and the primary enabler of Combatant Command (COCOM) [Geographic Combatant Command (GCC)] Theater Campaign Plans. This memorandum continued by pointing out some of the intricacies and challenges of the environment.

Personnel assigned to SCOs belong to the respective GCC, and are staffed in accordance with the GCC Joint Tables of Distribution (JTD) and Joint Manning Documents (JMD). DSCA and the GCCs, working in concert with the Joint Chiefs of Staff J1 and the military departments (MILDEPs), are responsible for proper staffing of the SCOs. With the level of responsibility for SCO staffing cutting across four levels of command (i.e., GCC, Joint Staff, MILDEP, and OUSD(P)/DSCA), a unified effort to identify and designate those SCO positions requiring training will require work-intensive coordination.

Personnel staffing of SCOs can consist of U.S. military, U.S. DOD civilians, local national civilians (typically in high-skill, programmatic positions such as budget or training management) and local national contractors. This mix of nationalities, career status (military and civilian), and skill sets will make it difficult to determine and implement a standard training model for all.

There are no standard functional staffing models for SCOs because they are organized and tailored to meet the unique SA/SC objectives for the country in which they are assigned. Some positions devote full-time attention to SA; others have responsibilities divided between SA, SC, and other duties. This will limit the amount of standardization possible across the six GCCs with respect to resources and training. Some SCO positions are located in regions supported with one-year tours of duty; others are in multi-year tour regions. The need for formal training in support of a one-year billet will be more time-sensitive than that of a multi-year billet. SCOs and the billets of those assigned to SA positions are funded by Title 22 security assistance funds. Additionally, many SCOs also receive DOD-appropriated funds (Title 10) to resource billets and operations in support of DOD SC programs. This mixture of funding sources, in some cases present in the same SCO, will make the management of education programs more challenging.

OSD provided some basic taskings to be implemented by DSCA as part of the overall effort.

A *Mission Essential Task List* (METL) will be developed as part of the Director, DSCA's Global SCO Review [Editor's note: This effort had already been initiated]. This list will differentiate between Title 22 and Title 10 functions. Workload data will be gathered by way of a survey and analyzed. Recommendations for both constrained and unconstrained SCO staffing levels will be evaluated for both Title 22 and Title 10 billets. The Global SCO Review will also advise fundamental training requirements for new or adjusted billets. These requirements [highlighted in the *Global SCO Review*], coupled with GCC prescribed SCO training [requirements], will be incorporated into the DSCA [training metric] performance measure and used to evaluate progress.

In order to manage this broad and extensive effort, the Director, DSCA has tasked the Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management (DISAM) to develop an action plan to meet the DOD goals and provide for measurable milestones (metrics) to ensure we are making progress. VADM Wieringa, DSCA Director, has provided the Geographic Combatant Commands and Military Departments a Memorandum of 10 Nov 2009, *Request for Support for Security Cooperation Training Initiative*. That Memorandum is provided here in its entirety. To this end, the remainder of this article will discuss some of the key activities and measurements needed to ensure SC training success.



DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY
201 12TH STREET SOUTH, STE 203
ARLINGTON, VA 2202-5408

MEMORANDUM FOR COMMANDER, UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND
COMMANDER, UNITED STATES AFRICA COMMAND
COMMANDER, UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND
COMMANDER, UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND
COMMANDER, UNITED STATES SOUTHERN COMMAND
COMMANDER, UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND
DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR
INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (SAF/IA)
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR
DEFENSE EXPORTS AND COOPERATION (DASA-DEC)
DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR
INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS (NAVYIPO)

SUBJECT: Request for Support for Security Cooperation Training Initiative

Over the past decade Security Cooperation (SC) has grown significantly as a tool of our country to build partner capacity. Each of you and your commands has significant equity and objectives for SC around the globe. There has been tremendous growth in Title 10 and Title 22 efforts. From 1998 to 2009, our foreign military sales has grown from \$8.1 billion to \$38.1 billion, an increase of 476 percent. Likewise, Title 10 efforts, on programs like 1206 Train and Equip, have increased dramatically. Over the last two years, due to operations tempo, we have struggled to ensure our personnel in key SC billets had training prior to reporting for duty. The Deputy Secretary of Defense (DepSecDef) recognizes a need for improved training and has added improving SC education as one of his top high-performance goals for 2010 and 2011.

In support of this goal, DepSecDef directed the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to develop a plan to educate 95% of the SC workforce by the end of Fiscal Year (FY) 2011. This plan includes personnel assigned to the Military Departments, Combatant Commands, and Security Cooperation Offices (SCOs). My goal is to have all overseas based SC officers complete the minimum required training by the end of FY 2010.

I have designated Dr. Ron Reynolds, Defense Institute for Security Assistance Management (DISAM) Commandant, to lead this initiative. DISAM will work with you to identify training needs and will offer immediate online training. DISAM will add additional schoolhouse and mobile training teams as required.

Please provide your point of contact information to Ms. Jennifer Snyder, [Jennifer.snyder.ctr@disam.dsca.mil](mailto:jennifer.snyder.ctr@disam.dsca.mil); Gregory Sutton, Gregory.sutton@disam.dsca.mil; and Dr. Ron Reynolds, Ronald.reynolds@disam.dsca.mil, no later than November 30, 2009. Please contact Dr. Reynolds, (937) 255-6538) with questions.

//SIGNED//

Jeffrey A. Wleringa
Vice Admiral, USN
Director

Who makes up the SC/SA Workforce, and How do We Measure Trained?

The DISAM action plan for achieving the DOD and DSCA goals is broken down into several manageable components. Those components are based on the answers to a few key questions:

- Who makes up the SC/SA workforce and where do they serve?
- What is the definition of trained?
- What are the capacities for training?
- How is the workforce motivated to achieve the training goals?

In previous documentation, the reader observed a number (~670) SCOs working within U.S. embassies and the GCC structures overseas. The number of additional personnel funded under Title 10, vs. Title 22, varies between occasional and daily involvement in either SC or SA activities, or both. The same holds true in the CONUS based MILDEPs and Agencies – DSCA via the FMS Administrative budget and in accordance with the *Financial Management Regulation* (DOD 7000.14R, Vol 15) - funds a substantial number of personnel involved in SC and SA activities utilizing both FMS administrative as well a operations and maintenance funding (O&M). As is the case in the SCOs, there are a number of other people with various sources of funding, who also perform some level of SC/SA activities. For example, a training organization within the Army, Navy, Air Force, etc which allows for international students to participate in course offerings will have an International Military Student Office tasked to interface and oversee the activities of the international students at that training facility regardless of the source of funding for their billet or primary duties.

Do these non- “FMS/FMF” funded personnel require training? Of course they do. While the level of training is the variable – not everyone requires an advanced degree in international relations - they most certainly need training at some level and should be counted as a part of the workforce. To establish not only the how many and where are they question, but also what level of training does the individual occupying a specific billet require; DISAM has developed a data collection tool and a training level matrix which has been or will be sent to all DOD organizations with SC or SA activities. The object is to go to the organizations themselves - those most knowledgeable - in both how many billets and personnel are involved in SC/SA, and what level of training each needs to effectively do their job. The data training guide matrix is shown below; however, within the next few months we hope to have a Security Assistance Network (SAN) based database where organizations will be able to enter data and updates directly, and training verification will occur via automated connection with the DISAM student training database. In the interim, organizations are filling in their position data, incumbents, and desired training level (along with a few other pieces of information). DISAM is then matching the desired training level of the position to the actual training accomplished, as documented in the DISAM student database, to determine any shortfalls, and further to identify what level of courses are most needed to reduce and eventually eliminate those shortfalls (to the 95% goal).

Minimum Training Requirements Details Table

Training Level	Description	Details of Positions Needing Training
0	None	Positions with no substantive SC/SA involvement. Examples: Maintenance, housekeeping, kitchen staff, drivers, administrative staff needing no SC/SA awareness.
1	SC Awareness (2-3 hour CBT) (Currently in development)	Positions needing only an awareness of basic SC/SA terminology OR Positions which have only minimal contact with SC/SA programs but require an awareness of basic parameters of SC/SA programs and resources available for further training if needed. OR Senior Commanders and Staff Organizations indirectly responsible for SC/SA supervision. Examples: Staff managing small SC/non-SA programs, GCC Commanders, National Guard Adjutant Generals and primary joint staff officers, SC/SA office administrative staff, International Affairs staff not working SC/SA programs directly, GCC J-staff not working SC/SA issues, military teams not involving SC/SA Activities prior to deployment. Those teams deployed in support of an SC/SA activity should complete the requirement of training level 2, SC Orientation below.
2	SC Orientation (12-24 hour CBT or 2-3 day course taught on-site at customer locations)	Positions needing a basic understanding of SC/SA program terminology and processes, positions working non-SC/SA programs, or directly responsible for only some aspects of SC/SA, but for which extensive knowledge of SC/SA programs is not required. Examples: SC/non-SA program managers involved with the transfer of military articles and services (ACSA, 1206, etc.) GCC - country desk officers with no SC/SA oversight responsibilities; MIL SERVC IA Policy Organizations - entry-level assistants; MIL SVC/MILDEP SC/SA Organizations - support staff such as supply technicians, computer support staff, office managers, budget officers, personnel lists, etc. Note: IPSR Course may also be required but will not be reported as part of the SC/SA workforce education metric.
3	SC entry-level course (SAM-C, SCM-O, SAM-TO, SAM-E, SPD)	Positions working SC/SA programs involving the transfer of military articles and services directly or supervising that work. Normally individuals in CONUS organizations will complete the SAM-C course, or SAM-E or SAM-TO dependent upon grade and position/function. See the DISAM Catalog at: www.disam.dsca.mil . For those deploying/assigned to overseas locations, DoDI 5132 January 9, 2009 required that all Security Cooperation Officers complete SCM-O or SCM-E. Course descriptions of these and all DISAM courses are available at: www.disam.dsca.mil . Examples: GCC desk officers, FMS program staff, Service International Policy Organization desk officers and program managers. SCO/SAO members, etc.
4	SC Advanced Course (SAM-CF, CS, CR, CM, AT, and AR)	Positions requiring advance understanding of SC/SA processes and policy. Examples: FMS case managers, FMS financial managers, SC training managers. Note: Because of limited training opportunities in 2010/2011, SC Advanced Courses will not be required to meet the SECDEF's 95% goal until after 2011.

Again to break this task down to manageable pieces, some might label a “work breakdown structure,” we have “time-phased” the organizations for data collection. As a visual presentation of that prioritization, we have a series of concentric circles where the organizations will be contacted and data requested in order of 1-5 with 1 being the first collected and 5 being the last collected. Our goal is to have all data collected and training achieved matched for all DOD SC/SA related organizations, regardless of funding source, by the end of FY 2010. A pretty big task when one considers the estimate of actual positions/incumbents will be in the area of 20,000. DSCA funds roughly 8,000 man-years of effort annually and many of those are personnel equivalents. For example, if four people in the office each do SC/SA projects as 25% of their daily tasks, DSCA may fully fund 1 person, i.e. 25% of the total of four people. What this means is that the ~ 8,000 man-years of effort that DSCA funds will equate to significantly more than 8000 people requiring training at some level.

Training Capacity?

Over the last few years, primarily since September 11, 2001, the throughput of students at DISAM has steadily grown to over 4900 students for FY 2009. The Security Cooperation Management course (SCM-O) offerings have had such a tremendous rise in attendance over the last few years that they have exceeded a single classroom space (>65 students). DISAM has “split” the class into two simultaneous SCM-O courses to accommodate the requirements as well as enhance the learning environment. The attendant increase in instructor requirements has been met by “surging the course teaching load.” It appears this requirement is not abating, and given our “EWAG” – educated wild guess – that the results of our data collection will not diminish but increase that demand. Coupled with demands from our CONUS workforce customers (SAM-C, TO, E, CM, CS, CF, CR) and wait lists for those classes indicates surging the instructor force is no longer adequate to meet the needs of the community. DSCA has authorized the immediate hiring of an additional six DISAM faculty members and two staff positions. The actual mix of courses requiring additional offerings will be resultant of analysis of the training shortfall from our noted data collection effort. In the long run, DISAM/DSCA have embarked upon preliminary actions to increase classroom space, another limiting factor, but in the short run, other alternatives will be explored – off-campus training in courses that have not been traditionally offered in that mode, temporary use of Wright-Patterson facilities, off base facilities, etc. The bottom line is that DSCA and DISAM are putting in motion a number of initiatives to increase our student throughput capacity, but the specifics in terms of courses, locations, and a myriad of cost benefit considerations must be based upon the analysis of the “gaps” as indicated by our data collection.

One might consider that direction from the DepSecDef and the Director, DSCA would be “sufficient motivation” to achieve the training goals articulated, but as often is the case, the devil is in the details. On-going conflicts of substantial magnitude in the CENTCOM theatre (Afghanistan and Iraq); a natural disaster of yet unknown, but certainly tremendous impact in SOUTHCOM (Haiti); a new command establishing a foothold in an area replete with challenges - Africa Command, and the possibility for other “high priority taskings” around the globe could bear on these goals. VADM Wieringa has augmented and committed the current resources of DISAM to attaining these goals and we will continue to provide feedback to DSCA, DoD, and the Executive Office of the President, Office of Management and Budget (OMB) at regular, specified intervals.

Achieving the Goal

We know where we are heading – our goal – 95% OCONUS SC/SA personnel trained at the desired level by the end of FY 10 and 95% of all SC/SA personnel trained to the appropriate level

by the end of FY 11. But where is the origin of our graph which ends at the 95th percentile? That is what we are currently determining via the DISAM/DSCA data collection effort. Once that point is determined, the greatest efficiency and utilization of DISAM's expanded capabilities will be put to the task and a series of "task completions," measurements/metrics, and new and innovative approaches (e.g. better use of distance learning for the basic levels of training) will be established to map and measure our progress to goal achievement. Of utmost importance to this project, it is not simply the goal of 95% of the workforce being appropriately trained; it goes beyond that in maintaining 100% accountability of the workforce.

While this recent "visibility" has highlighted the goal of a well trained workforce, it has always been the goal of many organizations involved in SC/SA, examples are listed below:

- DSCA initiatives on International Affairs Certification, the Graduate Studies program – GMAP II
- MILDEPs long standing use of internship programs and MILDEP specific training activities
- GCC's efforts to ensure their personnel training which may have been missed in the pipeline of new assignments, i.e., mobile training teams, on-site training, local on the job training sessions

Motivation of these organizations and the personnel who dedicate their efforts on a daily basis is not a significant area of concern. The challenge is to be able to provide these "troops" the opportunity to complete the necessary level of training in a timely fashion – that is the challenge that DISAM and DSCA must meet. We will keep you posted!

About the Author

Gregory W. Sutton is currently the Director of Research at the Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management. He has over twenty years experience in the SC/SA arena serving in a (then) SAO – the U.S. Military Training Mission, Saudi Arabia, and the Air Force ILCO (AFSAC), while on active duty as an Air Force Officer. As a contract FMS advisor, he was involved in several major international FMS system sales. He joined the faculty at DISAM in 1994 and was appointed Director of Research in 2003.