

## SAO MANNING UPDATE

BY

COMMANDER P. GREGORY PIERCE, USN  
DISAM Assistant Professor of Security Assistance Management

There have been numerous articles written, testimony given, studies undertaken, and arguments presented concerning the impact of the severe manpower reductions suffered in recent years by the Security Assistance Organizations (SAO) overseas. There was even serious concern that these critical in-country SAO organizations would soon disappear altogether. As a result of the most recent security assistance legislative changes and separately promulgated executive guidelines, this downward trend has been arrested. This article is an attempt to discuss the impact of these most recent changes on SAO manning, describe the current status of SAO manning, and examine perceived trends for the future.

### HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

To begin the discussion, a brief review of the SAO manpower history is necessary. The number of authorized US personnel, including military and civilian in overseas security assistance organizations numbered over 7,000 personnel in 1960.[1] Significant personnel reductions following 1960 lowered this number to 1,659 military and 182 civilians by 1975.[2] Even after 1975, the reductions continued until 1981 when the worldwide number decreased to 563 military and 137 civilians -- an additional 62% drop.[3] The manpower reductions were felt in all regions:

<u>Region</u>	<u>% Military Manpower Reductions FY 75-81[4]</u>
Africa	75
Latin America	75
East Asia & Pacific	64
Europe	64
Near East & S. Asia	61

Since 1981, military manpower at worldwide SAO organizations has actually increased slightly. According to the latest (Nov. 82) update to the FY 83 Congressional Presentation Document (CPD), which includes authorized manning levels for security assistance organizations and security assistance augmentations to Defense Attache Offices (DAOs), the number of US personnel will be increased to 614 military and 141 civilians for FY 83. The military increases for FY 81-83 by region are reflected below.

<u>Region</u>	<u>Actual FY 1981</u>	<u>Prop. FY 1983</u>	<u>% Increase</u>
Latin America	70	90	22%
Europe	109	122	11%
Africa	25	28	11%
Near East & S. Asia	150	165	9%
East Asia & Pacific	209	209	0%

Total SAO military increases from FY 1981 to those proposed for FY 1983 are slightly over 8% (563-614).[5]

Thus, although the reductions appear to have bottomed out, the total number of SAO overseas personnel still remains significantly reduced from recent years. It is interesting to note that even though SAOs remain at a reduced level, the number of countries in which either an SAO or SA augmented DAO is located has increased from 54 countries in FY 75 to 65 countries in FY 83.[6]

Even though manpower reductions impacted not only on military billets but also on civilian and local hire personnel, a slight trend toward civilianization has occurred at the SAOs. In all regions but Europe the majority of personnel at the SAOs are still US military.[7] However, since 1975, the ratio of US military to non-military (US civilians and local hires) has decreased in all geographic regions.[8]

### PRESENT MANNING CONSTRAINTS

The manning constraints that were previously in effect under the Monitoring Overseas Direct Employment (MODE) system have been rescinded. This liberalization of some of the manning restrictions has improved the ability of DoD to respond more quickly to changing real world requirements. Practical manning flexibility guidelines have begun to replace previous cumbersome restrictions which hampered DoD in implementing changes to security assistance programs for a particular country in a timely manner. Yet despite the easing of limitations, very specific legislative direction and executive guidelines and procedures remain in effect to govern the number of personnel assigned to SAOs. These guidelines will be discussed later.

The emphasis on maintaining the smallest practical military presence overseas is still a DoD goal. Specifically, in keeping with current DoD policy, the number of military personnel in SAOs is to be kept to the absolute minimum necessary to carry out DoD functions and responsibilities.

It should be noted that over time, increased emphasis has been placed on the utilization of specialized teams for providing advisory and training services to Host Country armed forces. There are numerous teams which are used in-country to assist the Host Country's security assistance programs, including but not limited to: "PCS" Technical Assistance Field Teams (TAFTs) and "TDY" Mobile Training Teams (MTTs), Technical Assistance Teams (TATs), Program Review Teams (PRTs), Defense Requirements Survey Teams (DRSTs), Site Survey Teams (SSTs), Quality Assurance Teams (QATs), Field Training Service (FTS) Teams, and Language Training Detachments (LTDs).

### CURRENT LEGISLATION AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTIVES

The most recent security assistance legislation, the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1981, amended Sec. 515 of the Foreign Assistance Act and eased some of the procedures for increasing military manning at overseas security assistance organizations. While SAOs may not exceed 6 military members without specifically being authorized by Congress,

the President can waive this limitation if he properly notifies Congress 30 days in advance of proposed increases. Additionally, the total number of military members assigned to an SAO for a fiscal year as justified by the Congressional Presentation Document (CPD) may be exceeded if, again, a 30 day notice is given to Congress. The specific legislative requirements are as follows:

Sec. 515,(c)(1) The number of members of the Armed Forces assigned to a foreign country under this section may not exceed six unless specifically authorized by the Congress. The President may waive this limitation if he determines and reports to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, 30 days prior to the introduction of additional military personnel, that United States national interests require that more than six members of the Armed Forces be assigned under this section to carry out international security assistance programs in a country not specified in this paragraph. For the fiscal year 1982 and the fiscal year 1983, Indonesia, the Republic of Korea, the Philippines, Thailand, Egypt, Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey are authorized to have military personnel strengths larger than six under this section to carry out international security assistance programs.

(2) The total number of members of the Armed Forces assigned under this section to the foreign country in a fiscal year may not exceed the number justified to the Congress for that country in the congressional presentation materials for that fiscal year, unless the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives are notified 30 days in advance of the introduction of the additional military personnel.

In exercising the provisions of Sec. 515, approval has been granted to add Venezuela to the category SAOs with over six military personnel assigned. A recently proposed amendment to the law will officially make this addition to Sec. 515 when approved. In November 1982 the administration proposed a similar increase in US military members for El Salvador. Of the large SAOs, the four largest are:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Mil.</u>	<u>Civ.</u>	<u>Local Hire</u>	<u>Total</u>
Korea	125	38	46	209
Saudi Arabia	81	2	10	93
Turkey	42	7	25	74
Thailand	32	5	17	54

(Numbers from CPD proposed strength for FY 83)

On June 2, 1982 a Presidential Directive rescinded all guidelines and other agreements previously in effect under the Monitoring Overseas Direct

Employment (MODE) system and issued revised procedures concerning personnel staffing at diplomatic missions. The purpose of the revision was to allow a more flexible, systematic, and expeditious deployment and management of personnel of all US Government Agencies operating under the authority of Chiefs of Mission in support of US foreign policy objectives.

#### MILITARY MANPOWER CONTROL RESPONSIBILITIES AND REQUISITIONING PROCEDURES

In addition to the legislative requirements and executive directives, there are DoD guidelines which must be followed regarding SAO manning. These guidelines are summed up in Chapter 2 of a joint November 1981 regulation, AR 1-75/OPNAVINST 4900.31E/AFR 400-45. The Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS) manage the military department manpower spaces for all jointly manned security assistance activities under JCS control. The control does not apply to TAFTs or TDY security assistance teams.

Since security assistance manpower is not managed as a special personnel category, it must compete with other DoD programs and falls within the same approved DoD end-strength ceilings. Limits on SAO manpower are a function of budget, military department capabilities to support the billet spaces, and the Congressional limits in Sec 515 of the Foreign Assistance Act. The largest number of SAO billets are filled by the Army. The service breakout by service for FY 82 is as follows:

<u>Percentage of Overseas S.A. Billets</u> <u>Filled by Each Service FY 82 [9]</u>	
ARMY	56%
AIR FORCE	26%
NAVY	16%
USMC	2%

(NOTE: Coast Guard billets are not included in the above. However, a few Coast Guard personnel have recently been authorized in some SAOs.)

All requests for changes to SAO manpower authorizations must contain the statement that the Chief of Mission concurs or non-concurs. The manpower spaces for each SAO are contained in its Joint Manpower Program (JMP). The JMP is to be prepared and forwarded to the JCS by the Unified Commander. SAOs are not to employ personnel in excess of their manpower authorization. The SAO submits requisitions for Army and Air Force military personnel through the unified commander to the appropriate military departments. Navy and Marine Corps personnel will be furnished without requisitioning in accordance with OPNAVINST 1540.48.[10]

#### SUMMARY

Within the past few years there has been a relaxation in some of the legislative restraints on security assistance manpower. Thus, the downward trend of the FY 75-81 period has apparently stopped and, in fact, authorized manpower spaces have slightly increased. Although there are still budgetary and other constraints, current legislation provides better flexibility to meet future necessary increases in security assistance manning.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Hammond, Paul V., Louscher, David J., Solomon, Michael D., "Growing Dilemmas for the Management of Arms Sales." Armed Forces and Society, (Fall 1979) p. 7.
2. FY 77 Congressional Presentation Document.
3. FY 83 Congressional Presentation Document.
4. FY 77 and FY 83 Congressional Presentation Documents.
5. FY 83 Congressional Presentation Document.
6. FY 77 and FY 83 Congressional Presentation Documents.
7. FY 83 Congressional Presentation Document.
8. FY 77 and FY 83 Congressional Presentation Documents.
9. DoD Security Assistance Manpower Accounting System (SAMAS) Report 1982.
10. DoD Joint Instruction AR 1-75/OPNAVINST 4900.31E/AFR 400-45, 1 November 1981, p. 2-1, 2-2.

## ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Commander Paul G. Pierce, USN, is Program Manager for DISAM's Overseas Course, and has been on the faculty since September 1981. His subject-matter specialties include security assistance (SA) operations overseas, foreign policy aspects of SA, and SA program development. Commander Pierce holds a BA in Far Eastern and Russian Studies from the University of Washington and an MA in National Security Affairs from the Naval Post Graduate School.