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CHAPTER I

Introduction

Among the most important foreign policy concerns of the United States is to help Europe’s new democracies complete their integration into the transatlantic world. Doing so will allow us to continue the legacy of what has come to be known as the Marshall Plan. We must support cooperative efforts and mentoring programs to help ensure the success of democratic reform. Forming partnerships with many of the newly independent countries of Europe has made the United States a leader in this concept. The United States is reaching out through the Partnership for Peace (PfP) and the National Guard State Partnership Program to help shape democratic institutions where totalitarianism once ruled. (Clinton, 1996, p. vii)

This bold initiative of PfP, to which President Clinton refers, was born in January 1994 at the Brussels NATO Summit. It is a NATO program that the US supports as part of it’s own national interest. The program was developed as a means to expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe, increase stability, diminish threats to peace, and build strengthened relationships by promoting practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles. (NATO Handbook, 1995, p. 19)

To accomplish this ambitious plan, the US military has been given a primary role to foster the development of military training. The end result of that training is the development of partner nations able to operate in any peacetime support operations environment. In addition to external effectiveness of the program, the following criteria were developed to establish internal indicators of excellence which include: better execution of combined exercises, increased staff interaction, reduced duplication of effort, increased connectivity, and solidification of the
North American link to the program nations. (Gehman, 1998, p. 1-4) The President and Congress have given the mission to Department of Defense (DOD) for implementation of the PfP Military Contact Program. In turn the DOD has delegated its execution to the Major Commands. This research paper will explore in detail how two of these commands conduct funding, selecting and scheduling of events, and administrative processes as they apply to the research problem.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to compare the United States PfP Military Contact Program as executed through the two major components, United States European Command (USEUCOM) and United States Atlantic Command (USACOM), and determine if reorganization of the program will provide better implementation.

Research Goals

To assist in solving this problem, the following research questions have been established:

1. Can the PfP Military Contact Program objectives be executed through a reorganization of responsibilities (funding, selecting and scheduling of events and administrative processes) and still accomplish the mission/national strategies in a better manner?
2. Determine if the purpose of the PfP Military Contacts Program can be improved through reorganization, as it applies to its workings within the military command structure and the participating PfP countries.

**Background and Significance**

An integral tool of the United States government's national security objectives is the PfP Military Contact Program. It ensures stability and security, encourages awareness and respect for the democratic process, and the pursuit of economic prosperity among PfP nations. The PfP Military Contacts Program is important, acting as a mutual foreign policy bridge with the National Security Strategy and National Military Strategy. Eligibility to the PfP program is open to those European and Newly Independent States of the former Soviet Union. The program has been in existence for only four years. Yet, this relatively young program has grown dramatically in scope and number of “exchange events”.

During the short lifetime of the program little effort has been made to examine the processes used to implement the program. Each major command has independently chosen to construct, develop, and execute the program with little regard for uniformity. Providing the program in this somewhat inconsistent manner can have some quite unfortunate consequences. Issues of cost, duplication of effort and general inefficiency can occur. Another issue is the potentially
strained and damaged foreign relations that can occur as the receiving nations see inconsistent program policy administration. Finally, the focused policy message of the program can become defused, and even lost, through inefficiency and bureaucratic process used by the commands.

A meeting conducted in the USACOM J-55 (PfP Policy Division) addressed the need for the systematic gathering of data to determine if the US PfP Military Contact Program goals were being met in the most effective manner.

( LTC Willis and LTC Hall, Jan 15 1998) From that meeting, the department head (COL Gallinetti) approved and agreed that a thorough review of the program be explored. Major General Miller, the J5 of USACOM, has given his concurrence and endorsement of this review. With support from both the commands, research can proceed to examine the PfP program for the first time since its inception.

**Limitations**

The limitations of this study include the following:

1. All materials used for this research project will be unclassified. Over 90% of the subject matter written in regard to the PfP program are unclassified. The study will utilize that 90% of data and not address or use classified materials at any point within the study.
2. In conducting the comparison, there may be some limitation in regards to the declared organizational structure and processes versus the actual processes in place in the commands. Interviews of those officials conducting the program along with a review of published documents addressing operating procedures will be used to establish the true nature of program implementation.

3. The term “better manner” will be defined from the ADM. Gehman Draft Paper, ACLANT/USACOM PfP TOR Draft 1998. This draft, the only written guidance to the command, states the following broad definition of “better manner”:

   Execution of combined exercises (cost effective as in value for the dollar), increased staff interaction, reduced duplication of effort, increased connectivity, solidified North American link to the program nations, and met National Security Policy and National Military Objectives.

4. The PfP Military Contact Program is dynamic and driven by US National Policy. This policy is primarily derived by collaboration between the Department’s of State and Defense. The Department of Defense then assigns the Major Military Commands the task to implement the program. The volume and types of missions are most challenging to a post cold-war military that is finding fewer and fewer resources with an ever expanding list of requirements. In an effort to keep pace with the demands, the military is trying to react quickly to provide necessary program support. That is one of the largest reasons the program is in a near constant state of flux and reorganization. The research presented will reflect a current snapshot of the organization and will avoid reporting on the many changes occurring during the time of the study.
5. The PfP program is a high visibility operation with a variety of military and government agencies support, directly and indirectly. At the point of actually conducting the program, there is a much smaller community of less than two or three hundred people worldwide. The staffing breakdown for USEUCOM and USACOM are about one hundred experienced PfP personnel at any given time.

6. Finally, there are many aspects of the program that could be considered for research exploration. The early research indicated changes in funding, event scheduling and selection, and administrative processes are three areas that may provide opportunities for better implementation of the program. Comments made through informal after-action reports identified the aforementioned problems causing the greatest amount of difficulty, along with excellent potential for improvement. Other subject areas within the program may also be suitable candidates for further PfP program study.

Assumptions

This study will be conducted with the following assumptions:

1. The research study assumes that there are potential opportunities for change that will benefit the way the program is administered. ADM Gehman articulates the criterion for this change in his paper ACLANT/USACOM PfP TOR Draft 1998.
2. Growth of the PfP program may well occur to some degree within the span of the study. It is postulated that the major policy and implementation apparatus will change little during the course of the research.

3. Since the researcher is working in the USACOM J-55 Center, he will continue to have support in gaining access to research assets, interviews and additional materials as necessary.

**Procedures**

Questionnaire materials were prepared and administered to selected military officers to obtain detailed comparative data between the approaches of the Major Subordinate Commands of USACOM and USEUCOM as they pertain to the PfP Military Contact Program. A copy of the questionnaire used in this study is located in Appendix A. A sample of the cover letter and follow-up letter can be found in Appendix B. All questionnaire packages included a cover letter, the questionnaire, and a postage-paid return envelope.

**Definition of Terms**

The mixture of military and political language leads to a list of words and acronyms that will need to be defined. Below are a list of words, acronyms and meanings that may be unfamiliar to the reader.

1. CINC-Commander in Chief – This is not to be confused with the President of the U.S. who is the overall Commander in Chief. The CINC used in this report is
referring to the military leader (normally a four-star/flag equivalent) that is in charge of a major area of the world, called Major Command, or major functional area.

2. PfP-Partners for Peace

3. Better-better execution of combined exercises (cost effective as in value for the dollar), increased staff interaction, reduced duplication of effort, increased connectivity, solidified North American link to the program nations, and met National Security Policy and National Military Objectives.

4. USACOM-United States Atlantic Command

5. USEUCOM-United States European Command

6. USCENTCOM-United States Central Command

7. NATO-North Atlantic Treaty Organization

8. J-5-Plans and Policy Division

9. J-55-the support arm for plans and coordination of the PfP program of events.

10. NIS-Newly Independent States include: Albania, Macedonia, Poland, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia, Romania, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Finland, Slovakia, Austria, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan, Ukraine, Georgia, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Russia.

11. Interagency-A council of US government agencies that includes the State Department and Department of Defense as a minimum. It may also include the CIA, FBI, FEMA, Department of Energy and other agencies deemed appropriate for representation or coordination.
12. Deconfliction - This is a commonly used military word referring to establishing prior coordination to insure that there are no scheduling conflicts or other competing events occurring simultaneously.

13. Services - This refers to these Department of Defense organizations consisting of the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marines.

**Chapter Overview**

The first chapter has been a general introduction that addresses the PfP Military Contacts Program as a major tool for the implementation of foreign policy to the newly formed states of the former USSR. It acknowledges the research problem of comparing the United States PfP Military Contact Program as executed through the two major components, United States European Command (USEUCOM) and United States Atlantic Command (USACOM), and determining if changes in funding, event selection and scheduling, and administrative processes of the program will provide better implementation. It establishes the importance of this subject as a research project from a US National Security, Military Strategy and Major Subordinate Command prospective. The limitations of the study were discussed as well as the assumptions upon which the study was based. The procedure for collection of data consisted of a questionnaire. Included in the research is a section where unfamiliar terms and acronyms are defined. Finally, the section summarized the chapter. The preceding chapters will consider the review of literature, methods and procedures, finding, and summary, conclusions and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

Review of Literature

Chapter II is the Review of Literature. It provides a backdrop and historical perspective on the PfP program. This chapter will examine the literature as described in the following sections: The History of the PfP Military Contacts Program, Responsibilities of USACOM and USEUCOM for the PfP Military Contacts Program, and Organizational Structure, Administration and Execution of the PfP Military Contacts Program.

THE HISTORY OF THE PfP MILITARY CONTACTS PROGRAM

General George C. Marshall had a vision of Europe united from the Atlantic to the Urals in peace, freedom and democracy. At its core, the Marshall Plan was about building peaceful, free market democracies. "Marshall lived to see part of his dream fulfilled in Western Europe, but the Cold War kept Europe from being either united or wholly democratic." (Perry, 1996, p. 7-16) In 1989, the Berlin Wall came down. This historic event marked the end of the paradigm around which the US had organized its Post War Foreign Policy. The end of the Berlin Wall and break-up of the USSR started an era of building new relationships and partnership opportunities.
At the January 1994 Brussels Summit (NATO) alliance leaders announced, we have decided to launch an immediate and practical program that will transform the relationship between NATO and Central Europe and the NIS (Newly Independent States). This new program goes beyond dialogue and cooperation to forge a real partnership, a Partnership for Peace. (NATO Handbook, 1995, pp. 50-51)

In addition to the NATO program, the US wanted to establish its own program of partnership that would have a chance to bring the Marshall Plan vision to life.

(US) PfP provides a means for integrating the newly freed nations of Central and Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States into the security architecture of Europe as a whole. The partnership is not simply a military or a security program, because it has peace, freedom and democracy as its foundation. (Perry, 1996, p. 8)

Since 1994, 27 countries have become signatories into the US PfP program. The Deputy Minister of Defense of Poland describes the vitality and importance of the program this way.

The Partnership for Peace is the most dynamic element of European security today. It creates a new climate of international relations. It is helping to transform the military forces and military doctrines of the newly emerging democratic states of Europe. It helps establish a mechanism for the joint international resolution of crises and conflicts. (Karkoszka, 1996, p. 61)

The research of this study will focus on the US PfP program. The US program has set four parameters for countries to participate as a US PfP partner, they include:

1. a representative, democratic government, 2. a market economy, 3. a hard currency and rule of law to promote trade and investment and 4. Each country establishes civilian control of their country’s military. These goals are important, but for the military it is the need to advise and provide a model on how to work within a civilian controlled structure that is central. The theme of the events may
be related to peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance, or search and rescue oriented events.

The authority for the PfP and other military exchange programs comes from Congress and the President. It is through the State Department and the Secretary of Defense that the planning and methods to achieve program goals are accomplished. As it pertains to military involvement, the Secretary of Defense gives the Joint Staff the authority and mission to conduct pre-approved military contact events. During the year, additional non-scheduled events may be created and approved through the Interagency Council. These non-scheduled events occur through high level talks and result from the special needs of each country. More than ever, the planned events and the non-scheduled events act to strengthen US relationships and are used to further strengthen the conduct and impact of US foreign diplomacy.

Execution for the PfP program has been further delegated to the CINC’s of the Major Subordinate Commands. The two that will be examined are USACOM and USEUCOM. Events conducted by these commands are developed through deliberate planning and a “second way”, which is a more hasty or responsive type of event. The deliberate events are scheduled military exchange events negotiated through the respective countries Secretary or Minister of Defense. This process of negotiation is where both countries discuss what each other is interested in sharing and a mutual agenda for both parties is determined. The schedule of
events may extend out as far as two years in advance. The guest nations are then invited to attend and participate in a specific military operation/event and then, the visitors would host a reciprocal event in their country. These visits are further coordinated with the Joint Staff along with the Interagency Group (DOD, State Department, CIA, FBI, and other government agencies based on the kind of mission, politics, and other factors).

The hasty or responsive events are those occasions where the CINC can invite military delegations, from countries within their area of responsibilities, on short notice (120 days and sometimes less) trips. This gives the CINC flexibility to engage their military counterparts to create better relations and increase understanding in response to a special military or political event. This type of visit occurs frequently after a conference where the CINC wants to show another country’s military leaders how we conduct a particular military operation or exercise. These visits are also approved through the Interagency Group, but on a fast track system.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF USACOM AND USEUCOM FOR THE PfP MILITARY CONTACTS PROGRAM

USACOM Headquarters is located in Norfolk, Virginia. As a Major Subordinate Command, it has been given partial responsibility for both the US based NATO programs and US PfP Military Contact Events to be conducted in the United
States and Central Asia. This includes participants from Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan, Tajikistan, and Kyrgyzstan), Ukraine, Georgia, Moldavia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, and Russia. The J-5 Plans and Strategy is the responsible division for direct oversight of the program. The J-55 is the subset organization that implements and coordinates the PfP program.

The USACOM J-5/55 is responsible for developing and executing policy guidance, individual program goals and the means to achieve stated national/CINC objectives for the PfP Military Contacts Program. Additionally, the J-5/55 conducts coordination of program events among the subordinate commands within USACOM, and coordination with appropriate interagency organizations (State Department, CIA, Department of Defense and others). (Gehman, 1998, p.10)

Funding support for the PfP Military Contacts Program comes from six primary sources. These include Warsaw Initiative Funding, Traditional CINC Activities, CINC Initiative Funding, Nunn-Lugar Funding, Joint Transportation Funds, and Official Representation Funds. These funding groups have specific legal limitations for their use. One event may use a single source or some combination of all six sources for the funding of programs. The rules and guidelines that explain the funding process are difficult to understand, complex and vague.

The funding for USACOM is $12.1 Million and for USEUCOM it is $127.2 Million. USACOM conducts the funding process itself. It distributes money directly to the host for each event conducted. Money is sent to individual sites to be disbursed to designated paying agents. USEUCOM distributes its funds to the component Services in a lump sum for multiple events at one time. The money is then further distributed by the Services as events are conducted. (Gallinetti, 1998,
At USEUCOM, once the Services obtain the funding, the money stays with the service component. The method in which the funding is distributed results in differences in who schedules events and more importantly who controls them. USACOM funding is controlled by the J-55. This insures a large degree of control over all facets of the events. At USEUCOM, the funding control is given to Service components that in turn control the schedule and most facets of the events implementation. This aspect is a significant difference in program management.

USEUCOM Headquarters is located in Stuttgart, Germany. As a Major Subordinate Command, it has also been given responsibility for some NATO programs and all US PfP Military Contact Events in Europe, other than those assigned to USACOM and some Russian events. PfP countries included in the USEUCOM area of responsibility are Albania, Macedonia, Poland, Czech Republic, Estonia, Slovenia, Romania, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Bulgaria, Finland, Slovakia and Austria. Similar to USACOM, the J-5 is also the responsible division and the J-55 is the organization that implements and coordinates the program. The USEUCOM J-5/ J-55 also has the responsibility for developing policy guidance and establishing goals and objectives on assigned nations. In addition, it conducts participation and facilitation in the event planning process and assists in the recommendation process for all PfP nations under its control. The organization is tasked with providing lessons learned from previous
events, monitoring resources and managing program funding, and coordinating with the appropriate interagency organizations. (Clark, 1998, p.67)

STRUCTURE, ADMINISTRATION AND EXECUTION OF THE PfP MILITARY CONTACTS

The organizational structure of both USACOM and USEUCOM is very similar. The Joint Staff acts in the capacity of a coordinating body to monitor, facilitate and report the program results to the DOD. Other interested government agencies (State Department, CIA and others) can contribute and coordinate policy directives. The CINCs of both commands use their internal J-5 and in turn the subordinate J-55 to implement the PfP Military Contact Program. Figure 1 illustrates how USEUCOM and USACOM are organized.

Figure 1. USEUCOM and USACOM Organizational Chart
(USEUCOM Staff Book, 1994, p.17 and USACOM Staff Book, 1996, p. 28)
Administratively the programs differ in centralized vs. autonomous control. USACOM takes the approved schedule of events and assigns them to the Services. Services tell USACOM what units will conduct the event. USACOM then contacts the assigned units to conduct the PfP program event and works with each unit assigned on all events in a centralized manner. The USACOM monitoring takes the form of frequent in progress reviews that coordinate the details of how the event is going to be conducted. During the events USACOM often sends observers to monitor and observe the conduct of the event. USEUCOM also divides the events through the Services, but in contrast, it sends the funding to the Services and lets them conduct the event with little or no USEUCOM guidance or monitoring. USEUCOM's most critical requirement is that the Services provide an After Action Report (AAR) that chronicles the program events and reports highlights.

In USACOM the J-55 is totally responsive and support-dependent to the J-5 for the direction and theme of the various events. Mandatory briefings are required by the J-5 who in turn briefs the CINC on the upcoming events. The CINC is briefed with the details on the PfP events so he/she can influence the program through a variety of ways to include personal meetings with those counties representatives that he feels are most important to the command and nation as it pertains to military issues. USEUCOM has somewhat diminished control and input as to the events, their contents and scheduling. The command, by giving the funding to the Services to implement the events, has allowed the Services to become the
monitors of the event activities and planned goals. USEUCOM can still ask for briefs, reports, and use other ways to stay informed of future events, but as a matter of policy and protocol the command has turned it over to the Services. Even the CINC, as a matter of military courtesy, would have to go through the Service commanders and a variety of Services chains of command to gain a greater awareness of his events. This loss of oversight can easily result in the focus of the program and associated events missing the intended mark of the State Department and Defense Department.

Summary

The review of literature revealed that USACOM and USEUCOM clearly have different approaches as to how each of their PfP programs is to be ran. The focus of these differences center around budget and funding procedures, event selection and scheduling, and a notable difference in the way they handle the administrative processes of the program. Chapter III will describe the methods and procedures used in the study. It will also explain how the data was collected and describe the instruments used.
CHAPTER III

Methods and Procedures

Chapter III will explain the methods and procedures used in this report. It provides a description of the population used for the study and describes the instrument used. The section also addresses the method of data collection and the types of statistical analyses performed on the data.

Population

The sample populations for this study are senior and middle grade military officers (Major to General Officer). These are the leaders, managers, and administrators who run the PfP Military Contacts Program on a daily basis. Additionally, the sample is designed to select only those members who are currently serving or recently served (last six months) in positions related to the implementation and execution of the PfP Military Events Program in either USACOM, Norfolk, Virginia or USEUCOM, Stuttgart, Germany. This has been accomplished by prescreening invited participants by using command section-manning rosters that provide this kind of information. The population will be composed of 25 qualified individuals from each of the respective commands (USACOM and USEUCOM).
Instrument Design

For this study, a questionnaire using a five point Likert scale with questions was designed to solicit information in varying degrees or specific ranges. The questionnaire was in the form of 16 questions and several lines for additional written comments. The questions were developed to address the following areas: Personal Data, Funding and Budgeting, Event Selection and Scheduling, Administrative Processes and Additional Comments. A copy of the instrument is found in Appendix A.

Methods of Data Collection

To assist in data collection, a cover letter explaining the reason and significance of the study was expressed. A copy of the cover letters are found in Appendices B, C and D. The cover letter and questionnaire were delivered to program participants through E-mail as a primary means and traditional mail as a secondary means. A follow-up letter was also developed. If mailed traditionally, a postage paid envelope was included for the return of the survey.

Statistical Analysis

The data that was received was tabulated and analyzed by the researcher. Computations of scores for those questions were presented in the form of
percentages in relationship to the command they originated. The percentage for each of the questions was calculated and data were shown in table format.

Summary

Chapter III contained the methods and procedures used in this study. It provides a description of the population, instrument used, data gathering techniques and statistical analysis. Chapter IV will present the finding of this study.
CHAPTER IV

Findings

The findings that are presented in this chapter were compiled from the questionnaire given to a very select number of military officers that have a close working knowledge of the PfP program (six or more months of program experience), in USACOM or USEUCOM. The purpose of this study was to compare the PfP Military Contacts Program of USACOM and USEUCOM and determine if changes in funding, event selection and scheduling and administrative processes will provide better program implementation.

To assist in solving this problem, the following research questions have been established:

1. Can the PfP Military Contact Program objectives be executed through a reorganization of responsibilities (funding, selecting and scheduling events and administrative processes) and still accomplish the mission/national strategies in a better manner?

2. Determine if the purpose of the PfP Military Contacts Program can be improved through reorganization, as it applies to its workings within the military command structure and the participating PfP countries.
Report of the Findings

A total of fifty questionnaires were sent to senior and middle grade military officers (Major to Brigadier General). Twenty-five participants from each command were contacted and given survey materials to complete. After the first mailing participants were given a total of three weeks to return the survey material. On July 10th those who had not responded were sent a second request. After the second mail-out the total responses were as follows: USEUCOM returned fifteen out of twenty-five for a 60% total response rate. USACOM returned nineteen of twenty-five for a total response 76% rate. The number of questionnaires that were completed and returned was 34 for a total response rate of 68%. Table I shows the distribution of responses by both commands, along with data related to the background of the respondents.

Distribution of Questionnaire Response Data

Table I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM</th>
<th>USEUCOM</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-mailed/Mailed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Response I</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Send-out</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Response II</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-returned Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage Returned</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data Questions

The questionnaire asked each individual to indicate their rank, command and whether they had six or more months experience in the PfP program. The experience question was an additional check done against a pre-screened roster of participants who had six or more month’s experience in the PfP program. Table II provides information about the participants rank, experience and by command.

**Participant Rank/Experience Information**

**Table II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank/Experience</th>
<th>USACOM Respondents</th>
<th>USEUCOM Respondents</th>
<th>USACOM %</th>
<th>USEUCOM %</th>
<th>TOTALS/ PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Officer-07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonel-06</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>26.64</td>
<td>7 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant Colonel-05</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57.86</td>
<td>39.96</td>
<td>17 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major-04</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>9 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six Months Plus of Experience</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Questionnaire Responses**

The remainder of this section will explore the responses of the participants to the questionnaire. It will do this by tabulating the responses of each of the participants in the two commands (USACOM and USEUCOM). The percentage choice for each question by command will also be tabulated.
Question #1, Do you think that there is excessive time and resources spent to support the PfP program administratively? Table III provides information on how respondents perceive the use of time and resources used in administrative support functions. The responses to Question 1 in both commands were near evenly split with a neutral response. 53% of USACOM and 47% of USEUCOM commented on this question with a neutral response. Refer to Table III for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**Time and Resources Spent to Support the PfP Program Administratively**

**TABLE III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>46.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #2, Do you think there is a process to reduce the duplication of effort on administrative functions. Table IV presents that 47% of USEUCOM participants agree or strongly agree that there is a process in their command that reduces the duplication of effort in administrative functions. USACOM reported this issue differently. They responded by disagreeing and strongly disagreeing with a 47% margin, that there was a process in place to reduce duplication in USACOM. Both
USEUCOM, with 33% and USACOM with 37%, had a strong response to the neutral selection. Refer to Table IV for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**Process to Reduce the Duplication of Effort on Administrative Functions**

**TABLE IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #3, Could administrative processes be made better by consolidating the administrative expertise into a centralized office that would support multiple PfP programs? Both commands responded with agree or strongly agree opinions (58% of USACOM and 53% of USEUCOM) as to the administrative processes being improved by centralizing support for multiple PfP programs. Respondents from USEUCOM selected the neutral category by 40%, with USACOM returning a 26% neutral opinion. Refer to Table V for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.
Consolidating the Administrative Expertise into a Centralized Office

### TABLE V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #4, How many times have events in your command been cancelled or re-scheduled due to administrative issues? Question 4 helped define the perceived impact of the administrative issues on event cancellations and rescheduling. 60% of USEUCOM respondents reported administrative issues effecting events 0-3% of the time. 89% of The USACOM participants indicated a 6%-9% or greater impact. Refer to Table VI for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

### Events Cancelled or Re-Scheduled Due To Administrative Issues

### TABLE VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #5, Do you think your funding processes and procedures can be improved? On Question 5, the respondents of both commands selected agree or strongly agree (USEUCOM 68% and USACOM 67%) that the funding processes can be improved. Refer to Table VII for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

### Can Funding Processes and Procedures Be Improved

**TABLE VII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #6, How many times have events in your command been cancelled or re-scheduled due to funding issues? Question 6 helped define the perceived impact of funding issues on event cancellations and rescheduling. 47% of USEUCOM and 48% of USACOM respondents see funding issues affecting
events 4-5% of the time. Refer to Table VIII for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**Events In Your Command Cancelled Or Re-Scheduled Due To Funding Issues**

**TABLE VIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% or greater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #7, Are the multiple funding pools to support the PfP program events too complex and cumbersome? 80% of USEUCOM and 79% of USACOM respondents agree or strongly agree that multiple funding pool issues affect the funding process. There was only one response of disagree or strongly disagree found in either command. Refer to Table IX for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.
Funding Pools to Support the PfP Program

TABLE IX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>46.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #8, Is there a strong interaction with the budgetary staff in your command? Question 8 indicated both commands show a strong interaction with their budgetary staff. USACOM has an 84% agree or strongly agree. USEUCOM has a 60% agree or strongly agree result. The higher interaction that USACOM has with its budgetary staff was consistent with its higher degree of involvement in running and monitoring its PfP program. Refer to Table X for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

The Budgetary Staff In Your Command

TABLE X

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question #9, How many times have events in your command been cancelled or re-scheduled due to schedule deconfliction problems? Question 9 helps examine the perceived impact of scheduling coordination issues on event cancellations and rescheduling. 66% of USEUCOM respondents recognized scheduling coordination issues affecting events 1-3% of the time. 58% of USACOM observed the scheduling coordination issues affecting events 4-5% of the time. Refer to Table XI for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**Events Cancelled or Re-Scheduled Due To Schedule Deconfliction Problems**

**TABLE XI**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>66.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.86</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9% or greater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #10, Is there an ongoing After Action Reporting process with PfP countries. USACOM responded with 67% agreeing or strongly agreeing. With
quite different results, USEUCOM respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed by 93%. An interesting note on this question is that out of the 34 total respondents only two choose a neutral response. Refer to Table XII for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**After Action Reporting Process with PfP Countries**

**TABLE XII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>USACOM</th>
<th>USEUCOM</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>39.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.78</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #11, What percent of events are scheduled 180 days prior to event execution? The USACOM J5, Major General Miller, declared that 180-days would be the recommended time in advance any PfP event would be scheduled. Second, the 180-day planning timeframe is also tied to the military-wide training scheduling process in which both commands are a part of. USACOM reported 79% of the events are scheduled 75% or less of the time. USEUCOM indicated 67% of the events are scheduled 76% or greater. Refer to Table XIII for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.
Percent of Events Scheduled 180 Days Prior To Event Execution

TABLE XIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65% or less</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.56</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-75%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47.34</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-85%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>59.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86-95%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96% or greater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #12, When are host units (on the average) notified of the scheduled event? Question 12 asks respondents to indicate what is the average lead-time given to host units when they are sponsoring PfP events. USEUCOM responded with a 100% of hosting units getting notified with 90 days or more. 87% of USEUCOM respondents affirmed 120 days or more notification was given to hosting units. The response from USA COM shows 89% of the respondents identified the average notification of 90 days or less. In many cases training is locked-in-advance by 12-18 months. These time frames become critical when range training, chemical and biological protection training, training deployment missions, schools, and field training is being conducted. The recommended advanced notification time for USA COM was 180 days. General Miller of the USA COM J-5 set the PfP program minimum standard in host notification for USA COM at 90 days or the event was to be cancelled. This means 37% of USA COM respondents acknowledge that on the average the command is falling
short of the minimum standard. Refer to Table XIV for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**Table XIV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Days or Less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Days</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Days</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>59.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Days or More</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Question #13, What is the optimum notification time to give to the host unit?**

Question 13 followed the same line of inquiry as question 12. It asks what is the optimum advance time to give hosting units. USACOM responded with 74% choosing 150 or more days advance and 100% selecting 120 days or more days. USEUCOM responded with 67% indicating 150 or more days and 87% finding for 120 or more days. Refer to Table XV for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.
Table XV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimum Time Give for Host Unit Notification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 Days or Less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 Days</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 Days</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150 Days or More</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>73.64</td>
<td>66.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #14, Do you think that more training should be given in the area of PfP funding? USACOM indicated an agree or strongly agree opinion on this question with 79%. In contrast, USEUCOM responded with an agree or strongly agree reply with only 33%. It is clear that additional training for PfP funding processing is desired by USACOM. Results from USEUCOM are far less indicative that funding training is necessary. The response to this question is understandable in the way each of the commands run their programs. USACOM is responsible for the funding process for each event, therefore it is more involved with the funding process. USEUCOM in contrast, for the most part, processes a check to each of the four services and the majority of their funding tasks are completed. Refer to Table XVI for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.
More Training in the Area of PfP Funding

TABLE XVI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.82</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52.60</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question #15, Do you think that more training should be given in the area of PfP administration? Both commands responded with agree or strongly agree opinions, 63% by USACOM and 73% by USEUCOM. Refer to Table XVII for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

Training In the Area of PfP Administration

TABLE XVII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>26.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td>46.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.30</td>
<td>19.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question # 16, Do you think that more training should be given in the area of PfP event scheduling? USACOM indicated they agreed or strongly agreed by 63%. USEUCOM had a 40% agree or strongly agree with 53% of their respondents indicating a neutral response. It is clear USACOM sees the need for more training, where USEUCOM is far less concerned with training in the area. Refer to Table XVIII for a complete breakdown of responses by both commands.

**Training Should Be given In the Area of PfP Event Scheduling**

**TABLE XVIII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USACOM Response</th>
<th>USEUCOM Response</th>
<th>USACOM Percent</th>
<th>USEUCOM Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42.08</td>
<td>33.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>53.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Comments**

The additional comment lines on the questionnaire provided the respondent an opportunity to give their unconstrained remarks regarding the topics contained in the survey. Seven of the thirty-four participants choose to write additional comments. These comments consisted of professional encouragement, a request to receive the results coming from the study, and recommendations for further
topics for research related to the PfP program. The verbatim responses of the written comments are located in Appendix E.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the data and findings of the 34 respondents to the questionnaire. It reported the findings on the United States PfP Military Contact Program {as executed through the two major components, United States European Command (USEUCOM) and United States Atlantic Command (USACOM)} to determine if changes in funding, event scheduling and selection, and administrative processes will provide better program implementation. Chapter IV also contains the presentation of the data in both a narrative and tabular form. Chapter V contains the Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.
CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The PfP Program is a valuable tool in the way the United States conducts its diplomatic relationships around the world. By using this military-to-military leader exchange approach, the program can help develop trust and understanding between the participating country’s military leadership. In addition, the program in a very unobtrusive way lets each foreign military leader that comes to visit the US have an opportunity to observe the dominant superiority and power the US military complex contains. This combination of building relationships through engagement, friendship and showing strength may significantly reduce the need for military intervention to resolve international matters of state.

To insure that the PfP programs of USACOM can accomplish this larger objective, the CINC is seeking ways to strengthen and make the program “better.” The “bettering” of the program as outlined by Admiral Gehman means better execution of combined exercises (events) to include cost effectiveness, increased staff interaction, reduced duplication of effort, increased connectivity, solidified North American link to program nations and meeting National Security Policy and National Military Objectives.

Research on the topic was conducted and resulted in the approved study to examine the United States PfP Military Contact Program as executed through the
two major components, United States European Command (USEUCOM) and United States Atlantic Command (USACOM). Both commands have differences and similarities in the way they approach and execute their programs. It is through this review that valuable insights for improvement may be established. The study will attempt to answer the following research questions:

Can the PfP Military Contact Program objectives be executed through a reorganization of responsibilities (funding, selecting and scheduling events and administrative processes) and still accomplish the mission/national strategies in a better manner?

Determine if the purpose of the PfP Military Contacts Program can be improved through reorganization, as it applies to its workings within the military command structure and the participating PfP countries.

This project has some unique limitations in that the target population was a relatively small and very mobile group of US Military Officers. Because matters of national security were part of the fabric of the topic program, great vigilance was taken not to probe into the classified arena. As far as assumptions made about the study, the most significant was that the three areas of funding, event scheduling and selection, and administrative processes will provide opportunities to create better implementation of the overall PfP programs in both commands. This was to say these were areas where the widest gaps existed and the greatest
improvements were possible. The military’s use of acronyms made for a full list of definitions of terms.

A review of literature was used to investigate the body of knowledge and information on the topic of the PfP program. Within the international relations and diplomacy arenas there were numerous books, articles and data. When it came to the narrower US PfP piece, research materials were less abundant. This limited supply of research material only helped confirm the need for additional study on the PfP program.

Methods and procedures of this study explained about the limited available population of knowledgeable USACOM and USEUCOM officers to conduct the survey. It addressed the use of the questionnaire as a means of acquiring information on the PfP program and the way the questionnaire is to be used to look at specific issues within the program. It defined the methods used for treating the data and the statistical analyses. A sixteen item questionnaire was given to selected members of two major component commands, United States European Command (USEUCOM) and United States Atlantic Command (USACOM). The study has set out to determine if changes in three major areas will enhance and better the PfP program. These areas are funding, event scheduling and selection and administrative processes.
Conclusions

Conclusions to this study were reviewed as answers relating to each of the research goals reiterate below. A comparative analysis between USACOM and USEUCOM respondents is also used to more accurately distinguish the sometimes different, but significant issues within each command.

Research Goal 1, Can the PtP Military Contact Program objectives be executed through a reorganization of responsibilities (funding, selecting and scheduling events and administrative processes) and still accomplish the mission/national strategies in a better manner?

In regards to the funding aspect, both commands responded with agree or strongly agree (USEUCOM 68% and USACOM 67%) in that the funding process can be improved. Additionally, both commands (USEUCOM by 80% and USACOM by 79%) agreed or strongly agreed that the current system of program funding was complex and cumbersome making the process difficult. Interestingly both commands found the impact of the funding issue to minimally effect the operational function of program through cancellation or the rescheduling of events. Both commands responded by 53% that funding issues impacted events at or less then 3% of the time. USACOM indicated by 79% that it agreed or strongly agreed to the need for additional funding training. USEUCOM was more neutral to this funding training need, by responding with a 67% disagree or
neutral response. This funding training response would appear to be consistent with the strong USACOM role in the funding process in contrast to USEUCOM who delegates most the funding functions to the services. Overall the commands responded with the need for changes to improve execution of the mission and affirm the research goal.

In a question that addressed selecting and scheduling events, respondents were asked to indicate what is the average lead-time given to host units when they are sponsoring PtP events. USEUCOM responded with a 100% of hosting units getting notified with 90 days or more. 87% of USEUCOM affirmed 120 days or more notification was given hosting units. These results as referenced to the commands recommended standards indicate little change may be needed in this area for USEUCOM. The response from USACOM showed 89% identified the average notification of 90 days or less. The response to this question is troubling in light of the command standards. There are devastating implications for unit training, particularly where special training (e.g., ranges, chemical and biological protection training, training deployment missions, schools, and field training) is committed to and in many cases locked-in advance by 12-18 months. The recommended advanced notification time for USACOM was 180 days. General Miller of the USACOM J-5 set the PtP program minimum standard in host notification for USACOM at 90 days or the event was to be cancelled. This means 37% of USACOM respondents acknowledge that on the average the command is falling short of the minimum standard. The data obtained from USACOM clearly
affirms the research question and the need for changes in the scheduling of events. When asked, what is the optimum advance time to give hosting units, USACOM responded with 74% choosing 150 or more days advance and 100% selecting 120 days or more days. USEUCOM responded with 67% indicating 150 or more days and 87% finding for 120 or more days. This data clearly indicates the need for procedural and/or organizational change for USACOM. USEUCOM also needs to examine their processes, but in comparison has far less of a problem in this area than USACOM.

Both groups responded positively (agree/strongly agree USACOM 58%; USEUCOM 53%) to the need for administrative processing change. In addition, 87% of the USACOM respondents indicated that events were cancelled or re-scheduled 6% or greater of the time (32% of the 87% respondents indicated a 9% or greater impact) due to administrative problems. Event cancellation and rescheduling was much less of a problem in USEUCOM with 60% denoting a 3% or less impact. The data from this question reveals that USACOM has a significant problem with its administrative support as it relates to the impact on the program execution. Question 2 gives some insight on the administrative impact differences. 47% of the USEUCOM respondents acknowledge a process for administrative improvement. USACOM respondents by 47% to reveal there is no process in place to reduce duplicative effort and administrative functions.
Research Goal 2, Determine if the purpose of the PfP Military Contacts Program can be improved through reorganization, as it applies to its workings within the military command structure and the participating PfP countries.

The data obtained from Question 3 reveals that both USEUCOM by 53% and USACOM by 58% strongly agree/agree that reorganizing the administrative process would make the program better. Only 16% of USACOM respondents and 7% USEUCOM respondents strongly disagreed/disagreed that the administrative program did not need reorganization. This response to Question 3 helps confirm the second research goals in a positive manner.

Funding is also an area where the data indicated both commands think that a change in funding process and procedures should be made. On Question 5, Do you think your funding processes and procedures can be improved? USACOM responded strongly agree/agree with 68%, while USEUCOM registered a 67% of strongly agree/agree responses. Reorganization efforts on this important function for running the PfP Program are clearly supported by the respondents.

The written comments made as part of the survey were basically supportive in nature. The most interesting aspect of these comments was the concern and satisfaction that was conveyed by the participants that finally someone was going to research issues within the PfP program. Additional comments were made by telephone and in person that were consistent in the desire to find out about the
results and express a gladness that someone was studying some of the important PfP program issues.

Recommendations

Based upon the finding and conclusions contained in the study, along with personal observations, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

1. A PfP program wide collaborative conference should be established where the issues of improving administrative, funding, and scheduling functions can be discussed. This forum composed of subject matter experts from Major Commands, Joint Staff, and Departments of State and Defense can act as one of the first steps in researching, identifying, and developing appropriate solutions to PfP program wide problems. The enthusiasm and interest found during the research survey indicates there will be very strong support for this type of gathering.

2. A study be made that examines PfP program measures of effectiveness and means to determine achievement of its desired purposes. The finding that 93% of USEUCOM respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that there was after action reporting from countries involved in the event is a major statement of concern. Some method of measuring the effectiveness of the relationship building progress
would appear to be necessary in conducting successful events with each partner.

3. The Joint Staff should establish a web site where the Major Commands can establish a collaborative means to share PfP program information and gain program insights. Innovative program practices can be presented with names and points of contact information for further reference. Information about the program can be networked, offering a more collaborative and complete top-down/bottom-up mode of communication. This site could provide near real-time guidance by Departments of Defense and Department of State officials. This new tool could directly assist in providing opportunities for greater program efficiency and effectiveness.

4. A study should be conducted that probes the impact to the Service’s effectiveness and efficiency in executing PfP events under the current USEUCOM process. The research survey found that the USEUCOM method of delegating PfP program events to the Services early made USEUCOM look far more efficient and maybe more effective than their USACOM counterparts. In fact, there is simply not enough information on the impact to the Service components of USEUCOM to endorse a change to this Service delegation process.

5. A formal training program be developed for the core PfP program implementers. The course curriculum can be built by establishing a training course subcommittee while attending the PfP Conference and
can gain valuable input from the new website. (See Recommendation #1 and #3).

6. An audit of the complete PfP program financial process be conducted in all the Commands. This effort could more clearly identify the process, find potential opportunities to streamline and improve efficiency and effectiveness. It would also help address one of the interesting written comments of a survey respondent “What happens to the money that EUCOM gives to the Services when an event is cancelled?”
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Sample PfP Program Questionnaire
PfP Program Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to examine and explore the Military Contact Programs as executed through USEUCOM and USACOM to determine if changes in funding, event selection and scheduling and administrative processes would provide better program implementation.

Please fill in the following information.

Name __________________________ Grade ______ Command ______
Last Name, First Name, Middle Initial (O-3, O-4, etc.) ACOM/EUCOM

How many months have you worked on the PfP program? ______

Date Completed Questionnaire ________________

Please read each question and select the closest answer that reflects your opinion best.

Do you think that there is excessive time and resources spent to support the PfP program administratively?

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

2. Do you think there is a process to reduce the duplication of effort on administrative functions?

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree

3. Could administrative processes be made better by consolidating the administrative expertise into a centralized office that would support multiple PfP programs?

☐ Strongly Agree ☐ Agree ☐ Neutral ☐ Disagree ☐ Strongly Disagree
4. How many times have events in your command been cancelled or rescheduled due to administrative issues?

☐ 0%  ☐ 1-3%  ☐ 4-5%  ☐ 6-8%  ☐ 9% or Greater

5. Do you think your funding processes and procedures can be improved?

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

6. How many times have events in your command been cancelled or rescheduled due to funding issues?

☐ 0%  ☐ 1-3%  ☐ 4-5%  ☐ 6-8%  ☐ 9% or Greater

7. Are the multiple funding pools to support the PfP program events too complex and cumbersome?

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

8. Is there a strong interaction with the budgetary staff in your command?

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

9. How many times have events in your command been cancelled or rescheduled due to schedule deconfliction problems?

☐ 0%  ☐ 1-3%  ☐ 4-5%  ☐ 6-8%  ☐ 9% or Greater
10. Is there an ongoing After Action Reporting process with PfP countries.

[ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Neutral  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree

11. What percent of events are scheduled 180 days prior to event execution?

[ ] 65% or less  [ ] 66-75%  [ ] 76-85%  [ ] 86-95%  [ ] 96% or Greater

12. When are host units on the average notified of the scheduled event?

[ ] 180 Days Plus  [ ] 120 Days or Less  [ ] 90 Days or Less  [ ] 60 Days or Less  [ ] 30 Days or Less

13. What is the optimum time to give notification to the host unit?

[ ] 180 Days Plus  [ ] 120 Days or Less  [ ] 90 Days or Less  [ ] 60 Days or Less  [ ] 30 Days or Less

14. Do you think that more training should be given in the area of PfP of funding?

[ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Neutral  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree

15. Do you think more training should be given in the area of PfP administration?

[ ] Strongly Agree  [ ] Agree  [ ] Neutral  [ ] Disagree  [ ] Strongly Disagree
16. Do you think that more training should be given in the area of PfP event scheduling?

☐ Strongly Agree  ☐ Agree  ☐ Neutral  ☐ Disagree  ☐ Strongly Disagree

Additional Comments

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for assisting me with this study. Your inputs are important and appreciated.

VR
Major JOHN T. NESLER
Appendix B

European Version Mail/E-mail to Request Survey Participation
June 8 1998

Major John T. Nesler
1061 Chinquapin Ln.
Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23451

Dear Major Beverly:

During the last year, I have been working at the J-55, Partners for Peace Program, USACOM. While working on several nation member assignments that involved combined efforts of USACOM and USEUCOM, I have observed a list of similar and contrasting ways each of commands administers and executes their respective PfP programs. It is with that basic list of similarities and differences in mind that I am conducting a study to compare the Military Contact Programs as executed through USEUCOM and USACOM and determine if changes in funding, event selection and scheduling, and administrative processes would provide better program implementation.

Because of your expertise and understanding of both the commands PfP programs it is extremely important that your inputs be considered during the research phase of examining the new program initiatives along with better ways to implement the program. Enclosed is a questionnaire that is designed to explore your opinions. Please complete this questionnaire and return it via the enclosed pre-addressed envelope.

As you well know, sometimes mail service from Europe can be slow. With that in mind I would much appreciate your response sent back to me by June 30th 1998. If you have any questions, please contact me at 757-836-6446 or DSN 836-6446. Thank you for your assistance with this important project.

Very Respectful Yours,

John T. Nesler
Major, QM
US Army
Appendix C

United States Version Mail/E-mail to Request Survey Participation
June 8 1998

Major John T. Nesler
1061 Chinquapin Ln.
Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23451

Dear Major Hassenberg:

During the last year, I have been working at the J-55, Partners for Peace Program, USACOM. While working on several nation member assignments that involved combined efforts of USACOM and USEUCOM, I have observed a list of similar and contrasting ways each of commands administers and executes their respective PfP programs. It is with that basic list of similarities and differences in mind that I am conducting a study to compare the Military Contact Programs as executed through USEUCOM and USACOM and determine if changes in funding, event selection and scheduling, and administrative processes would provide better program implementation.

Because of your expertise and understanding of both the commands PfP programs it is extremely important that your inputs be considered during the research phase of examining new program initiatives. Enclosed is a questionnaire that is designed to explore your opinions. Please complete this questionnaire and return it via the enclosed pre-addressed envelope.

I would appreciate your response sent back to me by June 30th 1998. If you have any questions, please contact me at 757-836-6446 or DSN 836-6446. Thank you for your assistance with this important project.

Very Respectful Yours,

John T. Nesler
Major, QM
US Army
Appendix D

Follow-up Mail/E-mail to Request Survey Participation
FOLLOW-UP

July 10 1998

Major John T. Nesler
1061 Chinquapin Ln.
Virginia Beach, Virginia, 23451

Dear Major Beverly:

On June 8th, 1998, I sent a very important Questionnaire out to you on the Partners for Peace Program. Because of your insights and knowledge of this topic, it is critical that I get your input. It is for that reason, I make this second request to ask for your assistance. To bring you up to date I have observed a list of similar and contrasting ways each of commands administer and execute their respective PfP programs. It is with that basic list of similarities and differences in mind that I am conducting a study to compare the Military Contact Programs as executed through USEUCOM and USACOM. This study will help determine if changes in funding, event selection, scheduling and administrative processes would provide better program implementation.

Because of your expertise and understanding of the commands PfP programs it is extremely important that your inputs be considered during the research phase. Enclosed is a questionnaire that is designed to explore the PfP program. Please complete this questionnaire and return it via the enclosed pre-addressed envelope.

I would appreciate your response sent back to me by July 30th, 1998 if at all possible. If you have any questions, please contact me at 757-836-6446 or DSN836-6446. Thank you for your assistance with this important project.

Very Respectful Yours,

John T. Nesler
Major, QM
US Army
Appendix E

Written Comments from the Respondents
WRITTEN COMMENTS FROM THE RESPONDENTS

The following items are the responses of the survey participants verbatim.

1. "It’s about time someone looked at the PfP program."

2. "John, Please share the results of your research with me. I’ve talked with my boss on what your doing and we would like to know the results."

3. "What happens to the money that EUCOM gives to the Services when an event is cancelled?"

4. "Major Nesler, This is a much more complex program then your survey would appear to address. I suggest that you will need a much wider and extensive survey to address the problematic issues involved in PfP. Good Luck with your research."

5. "If you do a follow-on study another important part of the program is the coordination between the command and the US Embassy. That relationship is critical in several aspects of running a successful program."

6. "The OJT method of preparing staff officers for PfP duty assignments hurts the command and the officer. The need for a preparatory training course is clear."

7. "John, I hope this survey is not all your going to do on this subject. What about the issues that surfaces with the military attaché and the embassy? I would be very interested what results you get on your survey. Please call me when you have the data."