

Meeting Minutes  
HSAC Public Conference Call  
May 27, 2010

Attendees:

Christine Schellack	Dr. Skip Williams
Charles Adams	Lydia Thomas
Becca Sharp	Frank Cilluffo
Ellen Gordon	Manny Diaz
John Magaw	Dick Canas
Jeff Moss	Peter Zotter

ELLEN GORDON: Good afternoon. I'm Ellen Gordon, standing — standing-in Chairperson of the Homeland Advisory Council, and I hereby convene this meeting. This is a public meeting of the Council, and we certainly appreciate those members of the public, the government, and the media who have joined us today. I also would like to welcome the members of the Homeland Security Advisory Council and members of the Quadrennial Review Advisory Committee who are on the call today.

Our purpose today is to hear the results of the Council's Quadrennial Review Advisory Committee's final report. First off, I would like to thank the members of the Council's Quadrennial Review Advisory Committee for their efforts in putting forth these recommendations. I would also thank the staff and Assistant Secretary for Policy, David Heyman, and the Office of Policy's Deputy Assistant Secretary for Strategic Plans, Alan Cohn, for their support. In addition, I'd like to thank Chairman Frank Cilluffo and Ruth David and Norm Augustine, who served as the co-chairs of the committee. HSAC member, Skip Williams also served on the committee, and I'd like to thank him for his service.

At this time, I would like to turn it over to Frank Cilluffo. Frank Cilluffo is the Chair of the Quadrennial Review Advisory Committee. Frank is currently the Associate Vice President and Director of the Homeland Security Policy Institute at George Washington University. Frank?

FRANK CILLUFFO: Thank you, Ellen, and I'll try to be brief, which is rare for me, since I've never had an unspoken thought, but I do believe it's somewhat ironic that we're deliberating today, the same day that the Natural Security Strategy is released, as there was a lot of deliberation in our group that in an ideal situation that the National Security Strategy would have preceded the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review and the other Quadrennial reviews, such as the Quadrennial Defense Review, but I think it aligns somewhat well based on a quick, cursory read.

I'd be remiss also not to thank at the outset Ruth David and Norm Augustine for their heavy lifting and for the entire committee, who did put a lot of time and sweat and effort into some of our deliberations.

The Quadrennial Review Advisory Council, for those who are not aware — as we're in Washington, we all need an acronym — we're known as QRAC — don't mistake that for crack, but the QRAC Committee, which was established as a subcommittee to the Homeland Security Advisory Council to provide recommendations and advice to the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security during the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review process. The QHSR was mandated by Section 707, which was an amendment to the Homeland Security Act of 2002, and the report itself was released earlier this year.

The QRAC served as an objective forum in which committee members shared very independent — and lots of it — advice in the form of ideas and feedback on key issues and questions that arose throughout the QHSR process. The QHSR obviously culminated in the report and was delivered to Congress on 1 February, and this document preceded that. It came after the actual report was released, and we thought it would be wise to compile some quick thoughts as a committee to the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review.

In terms of the structure, we met nine times during the period from December 2008 through December 2009. During these meetings, and most were full day-long meetings, the committee received numerous briefings and information packs from DHS leadership and the DHS Office of Strategic Plans in particular, which administered the QHSR program, and let me also thank Alan Cohn for his thick skin, because there was a lot of rigorous discussion. It was quite spirited, and he did yeoman's work in trying to absorb some of those thoughts.

The topics we covered included the actual review process design, its analysis and interim conclusions. We really were there to challenge assumptions, and much of the work was obviously in those meetings itself, and I laud the Department for recognizing the benefits of bringing an outside group — again, not a very quiet one, with very disparate views, to play a role in helping them along.

We also participated as a group in some of the review — some of the national dialogues on the QHSR, which was conducted by DHS in partnership with the National Academy for Public Administration, NAPA — and, again, I think unique for a department to reach out to every citizen around to provide some thoughts into the process.

The document was completed — the document was completed subsequent to delivery to Congress, as I mentioned, and the — this is the third and final QRAC progress report. Initial progress reports were presented to the HSAC during public sessions on June 5, 2009, and February 3, 2010.

The way we went about drafting our short report was to do a side-by-side analysis, aligning what was in the QHSR itself with what the statutory guidance was, provided by Congress, and we intentionally kept it very focused and honed in on three particular areas. The QRAC observed that the QHSR report describes an enterprise-level vision for the National Homeland Security enterprise and provides the necessary foundation for follow-on planning efforts. Given the diversity and complexity of the enterprise, the relative immaturity of this national mission, and the fact that this was the Department's first ever quadrennial review, the report understandably focuses on the need for unity of purpose across the diverse stakeholder communities to drive the unit — the unity of effort required for mission success.

The report, again, the QHSR reframes the Homeland Security mission and resets the strategic context through the definition of new core mission areas together with associated strategic outcomes, goals, and objectives. In short, our committee felt the report delivers on many critical statutory mandates but does fall short in some areas. Based on its review of the QHSR report, the QRAC, as a committee, generated three overarching recommendations.

The first was to define and operationalize the strategic framework — and as they were identified, security, resilience, and customs and exchange - by prescribing priorities and establishing clear linkage to the key strategic outcomes for each core mission area and aligning subordinate goals and objectives to that. So make sure that there's alignment to the outcomes and the end states as defined by the three core mission areas.

We also saw the need to map goals to objectives for each core mission area and key stakeholder communities so as to delineate their respective roles and responsibilities, to get to the roles and missions component, and ultimately to translate the goals and objectives for each mission area into measurable outcomes and establish meaningful near-, mid-, and long-term priorities and targets to drive the alignment of the Department's overall priorities, structures, systems, and resources.

So these were the three overarching, sweeping recommendations that we identified. They're described in much greater detail in the report itself, and if there are any questions, I'm happy to entertain those now and try to answer them, and let me thank again the committee and thank Chuck Adams and the HSAC staff for the heavy lift here and, Ellen, thank you.

ELLEN GORDON:

Thank you, Frank. We'll certainly now allow for any deliberations over the recommendations. Does anybody from the Council have comments on the recommendations before we proceed?

I'll ask one more time if there's — do any of the HSAC members have comments on the recommendations before we proceed? And if you do, identify yourself.

JEFF MOSS: This is Jeff Moss. Is — now that the other National Security Review is out, is there going to be any attempt to reconcile these, or do they all stand alone by themselves? And then the next time this occurs, it will be synchronized better.

FRANK CILLUFFO: You know, I'll take a crack at that, but, obviously, the Department is better positioned to answer some of that. The quadrennial reviews were mandated by Congress with discrete timelines that they had to be completed by, and the Department did so. So my guess is that in future quadrennial reviews, that would in fact be the case. You also had the Quadrennial Defense Review released at the same time as the Quadrennial Homeland Security Review, and there was also a Quadrennial Intelligence Review, which was in the off year prior to both of these reviews, so there was some discussion on the need to have a Quadrennial National Security Review that brings these pieces together, and my guess is much of that's captured in the National Security Review.

JEFF MOSS: Okay, and then — and you felt you got enough positive support from DHS in answer to all your questions?

FRANK CILLUFFO: Absolutely. I — there was some concern that we — obviously, in any case that we're getting information after — after some do, but I've got to put thanks toward Alan Cohn. He really did do yeoman's work here, and hopefully he got something out of our group. So as far as any government committees concerned, obviously you always want faster and better, but the truth is there was a ton of information and a short fuse to be able to complete that information, and for the most part I think I have no complaints there.

JEFF MOSS: Okay, thank you.

ELLEN GORDON: Thank you, Jeff. Anybody else have any questions or comments?

Okay, if there are no more questions or comments, at this time, HSAC will take a vote on the Quadrennial Review Advisory Committee Report to the Secretary. All members in favor of adopting the report, please say "Aye."

ALL MEMBERS: Aye.

ELLEN GORDON: Thank you. All members opposed, please say "No." Very well, by voice vote, it is unanimously adopted.

We are going to bring this public session to a close. Now, members of the public who would like to provide comments, which includes the media, who would like to provide comments to the Homeland Security Council may do so in writing by writing to the Homeland Security Advisory Council, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 1100 Hampton Park Boulevard, Mail Stop 0850, Capitol Heights, Maryland 20743 or by way of email to [hsac@dhs.gov](mailto:hsac@dhs.gov). Those comments are appreciated and will be reflected in the meeting minutes.

I declare this May 27, 2010 meeting of the Homeland Security Advisory Council adjourned. Thank you for all — for joining.