

RELEASE IN  
PART B6

**From:** H <hrod17@clintonemail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 25, 2012 10:40 AM  
**To:** 'Russov@state.gov'  
**Subject:** Fw: Fwd: Inside the Pentagon article on security-capacity building

Pls print.

**From:** haroldnaughton [redacted] [mailto:haroldnaughton [redacted]]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 23, 2012 09:22 AM Eastern Standard Time  
**To:** H  
**Subject:** Fwd: Inside the Pentagon article on security-capacity building

B6

Madame Secretary,

I hope this finds you well among the whirlwind of the last few weeks of the Presidential campaign.

When you were kind enough to meet with me after my return from Afghanistan in June, I promised to provide you with a report on what I felt needed to be done regarding the "civilianization" of Rule of Law and governance efforts not only in Afghanistan, but in other areas of American interest.

What I didn't realize at the time was that the Army had other plans and pulled me back in for a good piece of the summer sending me to the Dem. Rep. of the Congo on a mission training Congolese troops in Human Rights law, anti corruption and ethics. This mission was conducted with the Defense Institute of International Legal Studies, a DSCA Agency my Reserve Unit is now partnered with.

This duty held me back from doing a formal report to you ( I returned from this mission Labor Day Weekend) but I was able to provide my thoughts and research to the ISAB Security Capacity Subgroup.

The below Inside the Pentagon article outlines those thoughts and experiences. The full draft, which has likely already been forwarded to your office, can be retrieved from the ISAB office.

Additionally, the attached link to a Boston Globe article from this past Sunday highlights the growing need for dovetailing of DOD/DOS efforts.

Thank you for your time and I hope to see you soon,

all the best,

Hank Naughton

<http://epaper.bostonglobe.com/epaper/viewer.aspx>

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** "Herrick, Christopher M" <HerrickCM@state.gov>  
**Date:** October 18, 2012 11:31:48 AM EDT  
**To:** "Hartman, Richard W" <HartmanRW@state.gov>  
**Cc:** "Cooney, Thomas F" <CooneyTF@state.gov>, "Jenkins-Anthony, Thelma Y" <Jenkins-AnthonyTY@state.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: Inside the Pentagon article on security-capacity building

Dr. Perry, Mr. Curtis, and the members of the ISAB SCB Study Group,

FYI – the below article came out today in Inside the Pentagon on the SCB report.

Chris  
Christopher Herrick  
Deputy Executive Director  
International Security Advisory Board  
Office of Strategic Affairs  
Bureau of Arms Control, Verification and Compliance  
US Department of State  
202-647-9683

-----Original Message-----

Inside the Pentagon  
10/18/2012

#### Greater Role Urged For Civilian Personnel In U.S. Security Assistance

Given that the presence of American troops "can be controversial" within countries receiving U.S. security assistance, a draft State Department report urges using fewer military personnel and more career diplomats and civil servants from other agencies to accomplish the missions.

The International Security Advisory Board's draft assessment argues that controversies caused by an American military presence abroad could be reduced by making U.S. security assistance "more civilian in nature." Inside the Pentagon obtained a copy of the draft report, dated Oct. 15.

"This could be accomplished through greater use of career Foreign Service Officers or members of the civil service (from the Departments of State, Agriculture, Commerce, etc. and USAID) rather than the use of U.S. military personnel to implement security assistance in-country," the document states in a passage not included in an earlier draft from May.

A "substantial amount" of the in-country implementation of security capacity building -- including aid for predominately civilian functions such as law enforcement -- is performed by U.S. military personnel or temporary civilian appointees, particularly in war zones, the report adds.

"Over the longer term, a professional reserve corps of civilians with specialized skills . . . recognized as equivalent in ability to military reservists and full partners with members of the Foreign Service, could also serve this purpose," the report states. But assembling such a corps would be complicated and costly, the assessment acknowledges, noting the board "recognizes that a civilian reserve corps involves significant bureaucratic and budgetary challenges."

The proposed changes would be in addition to other steps U.S. officials have taken over the years to conduct security assistance with a minimal footprint. "One reason the United States focuses assistance on just a few countries is to promote particular countries as regional leaders," Naval War College Professor Derek Reveron wrote in National Defense University's journal PRISM in 2010. "This approach not only strengthens key partners, but it also reduces the need for American presence and the negative attention it sometimes generates. Over the past five decades, security assistance has evolved from a program designed to buy influence and access to one that is now intended to build capacity meant to obviate U.S. military presence."

Like the earlier draft from May, the latest version of the report argues the White House needs to develop a national security strategy for its multibillion-dollar efforts to build the security capacity of foreign countries, update Byzantine processes for prioritizing and funding such projects, aid more civilian security personnel as opposed to troops and find better ways to assess whether individual initiatives are succeeding or failing (ITP, Aug. 2).

The Oct. 15 draft recommends programs articulate at the outset "a substantial and effective means by which future performance can be rigorously evaluated."

In response to criticisms of U.S. security assistance, the report urges programs to document, either anecdotally or more quantitatively, examples of successful outcomes that are not well encapsulated by existing metrics. Such outcomes could involve "non-material contributions, or non-military interactions"; cultural changes; improvements in accountability, rule of law and human rights; more effective collaboration with U.S. representatives in-country; greater self-sufficiency; partnering with international organizations; and showing success after long engagement, the report adds.

Further, every one to two years, the State Department should periodically document how specific criticisms of programs have been addressed through an accounting of "lessons learned," the assessment recommends.

The Oct. 15 draft also adds language touting the effectiveness and the "bang for the buck" of exchange programs, both civilian and military. These efforts -- which enable foreign participants to study at an advanced school for periods ranging from a few weeks to a year -- should be safeguarded from budget cuts, the report argues.

"Like the State Department programs, the International Military Education and Training (IMET) and similar Defense Department programs are often on the chopping block when budgets tighten," the report states. "The Board sees these as worth protecting in an era of declining budgets, and in fact worthy of greater investment."

The draft report remains subject to change, although much of it is identical to the May version. The board has not announced when the final version is due to be released. -- Christopher J. Castelli

(c) Inside Washington Publishers

This email is UNCLASSIFIED.