

THE NATIONAL

POLICY AND GLOBAL AFFAIRS

ACADEMIES

Global Security Engagement

A New Model for Cooperative Threat Reduction

Report Release

March 6, 2009

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

Advisers to the Nation on Science, Engineering, and Medicine

National Academy of Sciences

National Academy of Engineering

Institute of Medicine

National Research Council

Origin of the Study

Public Law 110-181 - National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008

- TITLE XIII--COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION WITH STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION, SEC. 1306. NEW INITIATIVES FOR THE COOPERATIVE THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

NAS was asked to recommend ways to strengthen and expand the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction (DOD CTR) program, including the development of new initiatives.

Funding for the study was provided under a contract with the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA).

Statement of Task

An assessment of new CTR initiatives to include at a minimum:

- programs and projects in Asia and the Middle East; and
- activities relating to the denuclearization of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

An identification of options and recommendations for strengthening and expanding the CTR Program.

Congressional emphasis on interagency coordination, NGO involvement, transparency, sustainability, and shared funding.

Committee on Strengthening and Expanding the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction Program

Co-chairs: David R. Franz and Ronald F. Lehman

Members:

Robert B. Barker

MG William F. Burns (USA, ret.)

Rose Gottemoeller

John Hamre

Robert G. Joseph

Orde Kittrie

James W. LeDuc

Adm. Richard W. Mies (USN, ret.)

Judith Miller

George W. Parshall

Thomas Pickering

Kim K. Savit

A Note on Terminology

CTR – generic reference to cooperative threat reduction

CTR 1.0 – the original cooperative threat reduction program developed at the end of the Cold War and implemented in the former Soviet Union

DOD CTR – programs under the policy direction of the Secretary of Defense and as defined by the annual National Defense Authorization Act.

USG CTR – the set of programs across the U.S. government that are now associated with cooperative threat reduction activities

CTR 2.0 – the next generation of CTR

Report Structure

Chapter 1 – CTR overview, how it evolved, and program accomplishments.

Chapter 2 - Vision of what CTR 2.0 is and why the program should evolve in that direction.

Chapter 3 - Form and function of CTR 2.0.

Chapter 4 - Role for DOD CTR program in CTR 2.0 and illustrations of the types of programs that should be considered.

Chapter 5 – CTR 2.0 implementation checklist.

The appendixes provide references and other supporting documentation for the discussions in the report.

CTR: A Victim of its own Success?

Original CTR was visionary and revolutionary

- Bureaucratization, micromanagement have grown over the years

World faces new challenges

- Tools originally developed by DOD, State, DOE, and elsewhere, may again need to be mobilized, along with new tools that are desperately needed

Why CTR 2.0?

Software industry shorthand reflects both step-by-step problem solving and the on-going applicability of many existing CTR approaches to new challenges and new regions

Acknowledges existing momentum, from CTR 1.0, also reflects the Committee's conclusion that a more aggressive upgrade to CTR 2.0 is needed

Bold Vision – White House Leadership

Bold vision required

DOD and the entire USG should re-examine what CTR has already accomplished and refocus efforts to promote global security engagement in the 21st century

The Committee concludes that expanding the nation's cooperative threat reduction programs beyond the former Soviet Union would enhance U.S. national security and global stability.

Original CTR Program

Innovative, successful

- Deactivated nuclear warheads
- Destroyed chemical munitions, delivery systems, biological and chemical weapons facilities

Large impact for relatively small amount of money

Modified and evolved over the years

Today – New threats, much different than FSU

Asymmetries in warfare

Threat global and diffuse

Terrorism is “networked” globally
(vs nation states)

Technology revolution

Global access to information and
education

Need to Respond with All Tools – “Hard” and “Soft”

Hard: CTR 1.0

All: CTR 2.0

Response has to be networked (like the adversary)

White House-led global security engagement

- Security agencies – DOD, State, Energy
- Non-traditional security agencies – HHS, Agriculture, EPA

Academe, Industry, U.S. and global NGOs

Other governments, G8 Global Partnership

CTR 2.0 Key Concepts

High-level Leadership by White House and from senior department officials

Strategic planning – program and budget

Partnership, not patronage; develop a “Habit of Cooperation”

Relevance → sustainability – direct linkage between how relevant projects are to host countries and sustainability

Traditional metrics... plus new metrics to measure national security value of personal relationships and professional networks

New Applications (post-conflict environments, UNSCR 1540)

Need more program agility; less bureaucracy.

Central Role of Partnerships

Partnership in CTR 2.0 means shared responsibility for:

- ***project leadership***, including project definition and planning
- ***management***, including project organization, implementation, and oversight
- ***resources***, including personnel, technical capability, financial, and in-kind contributions Involvement in project leadership

Will contribute to sustainability and transparency.

Recommendation 1-1

The DOD CTR program should be expanded geographically, updated in form and function according to the concept proposed in this report, and supported as an active tool of foreign policy by engaged leadership from the White House and the relevant cabinet secretaries.

Recommendation 2-1

The White House, working across the Executive Branch and with Congress, should engage a broader range of partners in a variety of roles to enable CTR 2.0 to enhance global security. At a minimum this will require:

- *Becoming more agile, flexible, and responsive;*
- *Cultivating additional domestic and global partners to help meet our goals; and*
- *Building mutually beneficial relationships that foster sustained cooperation.*

Recommendation 3-1(a-b)

CTR 2.0 should be directed by the White House through a senior official at the National Security Council (NSC) and be implemented by the Departments of Defense, State, Energy, Health and Human Services, Agriculture, and other relevant cabinet secretaries.

- 3-1a: Domestically, CTR 2.0 should include a broad group of participants, including government, academe, industry, non-governmental organizations and individuals, and an expanded set of tools, developed and shared across the USG.
- 3-1b: Internationally, CTR 2.0 should include multilateral partnerships that address both country and region-specific security challenges, as well as provide support to the implementation of international treaties and other security instruments aimed at reducing threat, such as the G8 Global Partnership, the Proliferation Security Initiative, UNSCR 1540, and the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism.

Recommendation 3-2

The Executive Branch and Congress need to recognize that personal relationships and professional networks that are developed through USG CTR programs contribute directly to our national security and that new metrics should be developed to reflect this.

The role of personal relationships/partnerships

Senior-level military exchanges w/ FSU

Communication in times of tension

Networks of technical contacts between nations

Seek metrics that reflect value of these relationships

Recommendation 3-3 (a-d)

The legislative framework, funding mechanisms, and program leveraging opportunities should be structured to support more effective threat reduction initiatives across DOD, other USG departments and agencies, international partners and NGOs.

- 3-3a: Program planning should be developed out of a strategic process and be matched by a *strategic budget process*
- 3-3b: Congress should provide *co-mingling* authority to all agencies implementing programs under CTR 2.0
- 3-3c: DOD CTR legal frameworks and authorities should be reassessed and there should be a systematic study of the *CTR Umbrella Agreement* protection provisions, what purposes they serve in which circumstances
- 3-3d: Congress should grant DOD limited *“notwithstanding”* authority for the CTR program

Recommendation 4-1

As CTR 2.0 engagement opportunities emerge, the White House should determine which agencies and partners are best suited to execute them, whether by virtue of expertise, implementation capacity, or funding.

Recommendation 4-2

The Secretary of Defense should direct the review and reformulation of the DOD CTR program in support of CTR 2.0 and work with the White House, Secretary of State, Secretary of Energy, and other cabinet and agency officers to ensure full coordination and effective implementation of DOD programs in CTR 2.0. The review should also include broader military components, including the Unified Combatant Commands, the full set of programs in DTRA, DOD health and research programs, and other DOD assets.

Recommendation 4-3

A plan for the evolution of CTR 1.0 to CTR 2.0 should take into account the congressional principles enumerated in the legislation authorizing this report, as well as existing USG CTR initiatives. The White House should review NSC-HSC coordination in bioengagement as a possible model for other programs as it develops a transition plan.

Transition from CTR 1.0 to 2.0

Current models:

- Demilitarization
- Department-centered programs
- “Heavy” engineering projects
- Few true partnerships

New models:

- NSC/HSC Biosecurity Engagement
- Veterinary Surveillance in Russia
- G8 Global Partnership, PSI, 1540

Questions/Discussion