Unity of Effort Framework

Solution Guide



Improving Unity of Effort

31 August 2013

Approved for Public Release Administrative/Operational Use Only



Joint Staff J7 Future Joint Force Development (FJFD)

On behalf of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Joint Staff J7 FJFD Deputy Directorate continuously assesses, develops, integrates, and transitions relevant non-materiel

solutions across the DOTMLPF spectrum in order to support increased capability for the current and future Joint Force. The alignment and integration of Joint and Coalition Operational Analysis (JCOA), Joint Concepts, and Joint Lessons Learned provides the Joint Staff a set of core capabilities to support joint force development in a prioritized and comprehensive approach.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Joint Staff J7 Future Joint Force Development 116 Lake View Pkwy Suffolk, VA 23435-2697

We encourage comments and suggestions on this Solution Guide. Points-of-contact are:

- Ms. Angela Winter, JCD Deputy, FJFD, JS J7, 757-203-5877, angela.d.winter.civ@mail.mil
- Mr. Kevin Baumgardner, USNORTHCOM J-84, 719-556-8347, kevin.baumgardner@northcom.mil
- Mr. Juan Hurtado, USSOUTHCOM Command Science Advisor, Deputy Director, Science, Technology and Experimentation, SCJ7, Theater Engagement, 305-606-9250, juan.hurtado@hq.southcom.mil

The Unity of Effort Framework sites are located at: Intelink https://intelshare.intelink.gov/sites/uoef/def.aspx APAN https://community.apan.org/bp-psf/default.aspx

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DOD would like to thank Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, and Department of State for providing their expertise in refining and evaluating what has become the Unity of Effort Framework. Their participation, feedback, and patient explanations regarding terminology and cultural differences were critical to shaping the final Framework solution.

NOTE

Data depicted in the C-TOC WHEM Case Study does not necessarily represent the standard operating procedures and policies of the project participating stakeholders and mission partners. The data depicted is notional for experimentation purposes only. It does not in any way reflect official policies of any U.S. Government department or agency and therefore is not to be interpreted as authoritative.

FOREWORD

I am pleased to present this Unity of Effort Framework Solution Guide to Department of Defense planners and civilian agency partners for their use as an aid for theater and regional planning.

The Joint Force must partner with all U.S. Government departments and agencies to achieve its strategic goals and missions. Complex missions and multidimensional warfare such as cyber, combating weapons of mass destruction, combating transnational organized crime, and security cooperation remain priorities for U.S. national security and national defense. Achieving unity of effort to meet national security and national defense problematic due to challenges in information sharing, competing priorities, geographic mismatches, differences in lexicon, and uncoordinated activities.

Every day, U.S. Government department and agency employees work to protect the safety and security of the homeland and the American public from a wide range of threats. These threats include terrorism, natural disasters, cyber-attacks, national emergencies and disasters. The U.S. Government and the private sector must plan and coordinate their activities to prepare for these threats and to respond decisively when they arise. Success is dependent upon unity of effort enabled by collaboration and coordination among our partners over the full spectrum of operations from planning through execution in order to achieve our national goals and objectives.

The Solution Guide provides instructions for the application of the Framework procedures, templates, and definitions to aid interagency planners in improving unity of effort for complex problems that require coordination of effort across agencies and departments. The ultimate goal of interagency unity of effort is to establish a broad, consensus based approach, comprised of common objectives, applied across different geographic regions by all elements of national and international power acting in concert.

This Solution Guide represents the first version of the Unity of Effort Framework refined through participation of Department of Homeland Security, Department of Justice, Department of State, and Department of Defense. Your suggestions to further refine this guide based on its utility as a framework for interagency planning are welcomed and encouraged

Jon 1. Thomas

Brigadier General, U. S. Air Force Deputy Director, JS J7 Future Joint Force Development

This page intentionally left blank.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: PURPOSE
Scope2
Resources Required2
Benefits
CHAPTER 2: BACKGROUND
CHAPTER 3: OVERVIEW OF THE UNITY OF EFFORT FRAMEWORK
WHAT is the Unity of Effort Framework?5
WHY do we need the Unity of Effort Framework?5
WHEN do we use the Unity of Effort Framework?5
HOW do we use the Unity of Effort Framework?5
Stage 1: Initiation7
Guidance7
Stakeholder and Mission Partner Identification7
Stage 1 Outcome
Stage 2: Build a Common View8
The Three-Dimensional View9
Identify Common Objectives9
Identify the Common Operating Environment9
Identify Common Categories of Effort9
Stage 2 Outcome 10
Stage 3: Building a Common Understanding10
Consolidated Input11
Ranking of Objectives and Environment11
Key Intersections
Stage 3 Outcome13
Stage 4: Coordination of Effort (The Deep Dive) Optional Follow-On Stage
Deep Dive14
Deep Dive Activities14
Template Completion15

Stage 4 Outcome	
CHAPTER 4: EXECUTING THE UNITY OF EFFORT FRAMEWORK: C-TOC WHEM CASE STUDY	16
Stage 1: Initiation and Stakeholder Identification	17
Stage 2: Build a Common View	24
Identify Common Objectives	
Identify the Common Operating Environment	
Identify Common Categories of Effort	
Stage 3: Building a Common Understanding	
Stage 4: Deep Dive Planning (An Optional Follow-On)	
Coordination of Planning Events	53
Common Measures of Progress	53

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION	57
Inhibitors to Achieving Unity of Effort	57

APPENDICES

A. JKO Course Information	59
B. Glossary of Terms	60
C. Abbreviations and Acronyms	67
D. References	69
E. Facilitation/Coordination Group Detailed Template Instructions	70

ENCLOSURE

1. HA/DR-USG Preparedness for Foreign Disaste	r Response (Example)73
---	------------------------

LIST OF FIGURES

1.	Unity of Effort Framework Build Overview	. 6
2.	Potential Stakeholder Example for Stage 1	. 7
3.	Three-Dimensional View of the Framework	. 8
4.	Framework Matrix to Be Populated with Data by Each Organization	10
5.	Consolidated Matrix. Key Intersections Denoted by Stars	13
6.	Deep Dive Template	14

7.	Report/Briefing to Senior Leaders	15
8.	Unity of Effort Framework Stages	17
9.	Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime	18
10.	Potential Stakeholders Example	20
11.	Stages 1 and 2 High-Level Activity Model	24
12.	Common Objectives Activity Model	27
13.	Detailed Collection of Information for the Framework	28
14.	Common Operating Environment Activity Model	30
15.	The WHEM as Defined by Stakeholders and Mission Partners	31
16.	Common Categories of Effort Activity Model	33
17.	Identifying Categories of Effort for C-TOC WHEM	34
18.	Completed Three-Dimensional View Converted into a Matrix for Stakeholder Input	38
19.	C-TOC WHEM Organizational Matrix	39
20.	Key Intersection Matrix View (Data is notional)	42
21.	Key Intersection Example (Stage 3) (Data is notional)	43
22.	Completing the Framework Stage 3 Matrix and Cells	45
23.	Completed Stakeholder Input to Consolidated Matrix	46
24.	Example of a Completed Worksheet (Data is notional)	51
25.	Stage 4 Deep Dive Small Group Output Examples	52
26.	Blank Matrix	71

CHECKLISTS

1. Stage 1 Checklist	23
2. Stage 2 Checklist	36
3. Stage 3 Checklist	47
4. Stage 4 Checklist (Optional Follow-On Stage)	55

This page intentionally left blank.

CHAPTER 1 PURPOSE

The Unity of Effort Framework (referred to as the "Framework" throughout this Solution Guide) is designed to improve unity of effort by setting the conditions for increased collaborative planning across interagency organizations and mission partners for any given mission set.

The *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO): Joint Force 2020* recognizes that military force is only one element of national power. Strategic success will depend on the military's ability to operate in concert with the rest of the U.S. Government (USG), allied or coalition governments and their armed forces, as well as nongovernmental partners. There are eight key elements to globally integrated operations, and the fourth pertains directly to this effort:

"...this concept recognizes that military force is only one element of national power. In many cases strategic success will turn on our ability to operate in concert with the rest of the U.S. government, allied governments and their armed forces, and nongovernmental partners.

"More broadly, globally integrated operations will encourage collaboration across the Joint Force and with partners. It will allow Stakeholders and Mission Partners to bring differing perspectives and capabilities to bear on complex challenges. Finally, by enhancing military effectiveness even as U.S. forces grow smaller, it will allow us to be better stewards of fiscal resources as we defend the nation and its interests.

"Identify those agencies with which Joint Forces will work most often and develop common coordinating procedures. Just as the Services must not retreat from the search for higher levels of integration as joint combat operations slow, so must we continue to refine how we work with our interagency partners. Realizing higher levels of partnership will require identifying those agencies Joint Forces will work most often with and then developing common coordinating procedures and interoperability standards."

Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO): Joint Force 2020, September 2012

SCOPE

This Solution Guide is primarily focused on improving unity of effort across the USG interagency for steady-state operations at the theater and regional level.

RESOURCES REQUIRED

Use of the Framework requires representation, participation, and collection of information from stakeholder organizations. An organization must be identified to facilitate completion of a Framework for a selected mission and geographic area. The time to complete a Framework is dependent on the complexity and scope of the mission; this can take three to four events to allow time for stakeholders to collect information and participate through staffing activities.

Facilitating Organization	1 – 2 full-time planners/analysts, plus meeting facilitators
Stakeholder	Up to 80 hours to participate and collect information
Timeline	Depends on mission. For planning purposes, on average, conducting three
	to four events will take a minimum of six to eight months, with an average
	of two months of preparation per event.

BENEFITS

Use of the Framework provides many benefits toward improving unity of effort for complex interagency missions, including the following key points:

- Improves unity of effort without requiring a change to any ongoing internal organizational planning or programming processes
 - Maps each organization's unique perspective and priorities
 - o Results can be used to inform internal planning/programming efforts
- Provides a means for interagency organizations to reach a common view and a common understanding
 - o Brings interagency stakeholders together early in planning
 - o Establishes mission-specific common definitions/terms for greater understanding
 - o Highlights roles, responsibilities, and authorities
- Sets the stage for greater information sharing on capabilities, capacities, and activities
 - o Establishes and builds critical interagency stakeholder relationships
 - o Provides information for continued coordination of efforts for coherency

CHAPTER 2 BACKGROUND

U.S. Northern Command (USNORTHCOM) originally proposed a synchronization framework to help improve unity of effort in steady-state planning. That initial framework later developed into the Unity of Effort Framework and is the foundation for this Solution Guide. At the time of initial development, no single approved USG framework existed which could be referenced during the development of USNORTHCOM's Theater Campaign Plans (TCPs), i.e., there was no centralized repository containing the type of information the Framework can reveal. USNORTHCOM found that the synchronization model started to develop a clearer determination of where USNORTHCOM's responsibilities aligned with interagency partners. They proposed that the development and sharing of this Framework with interagency partners would improve unity of effort.

"The United States remains the world's preeminent power, even as a growing number of state and non-state actors exhibit consequential influence. This changing distribution of power indicates evolution to a 'multi-nodal' world characterized more by shifting, interest-driven coalitions based on diplomatic, military, and economic power, than by rigid security competition between opposing blocs."

National Security Strategy, May 2010

Adapting to the "multi-nodal" world described in the *National Security Strategy* requires increased USG organizations' unity of effort to counter violent extremism and to strengthen regional security. For the combatant commands (CCMDs) to work with other USG agencies in this regard, it is important to understand and respect that each agency approaches planning and strategy development differently according to their needs. Some approaches are formal and structured, while others are informal in nature. The resulting complexity across organizations results in a robust system, but only if agencies strive to develop strong relationships while learning to speak each other's language, or better yet, use a common lexicon.

"Planning for military engagement and security cooperation will align with broader USG policy. Coordination with DOS, USAID, Department of Treasury, DHS, the Intelligence Community, and DOJ, among others, should yield plans that complement parallel activities of other USG departments and agencies and consider Chief of Mission guidance for each country involved. Planning will identify assumed contributions and requested support of other USG department and agencies, and define how a command will enable the activities of other government entities."

Department of Defense Guidance for the Employment of the Force (GEF), 9 April 2011

USG interagency organizations face significant hurdles to ensure organizational alignment between plans and programs. This Framework project was developed with several USG organizational participants to identify important inhibitors to achieving unity of effort. Identification is the first step toward developing solutions or mitigation strategies. The Framework is intended to assist USG organizations to better understand a problem or issue by identifying goals, areas of interest, and categories of effort to be applied by each of the organizations for the mission or problem set.

CHAPTER 3 OVERVIEW OF THE UNITY OF EFFORT FRAMEWORK

This chapter gives a basic overview of the Unity of Effort Framework's structure and methodological underpinning. To help understand how to use the Framework, a case study is presented in chapter 4 as an example of executing the Framework.

WHAT is the Unity of Effort Framework?

The Unity of Effort Framework is a planning aid designed to increase shared understanding and collaborative planning between USG agencies and departments and to address security issues and disaster response missions. The Framework is a logical construct used to collect and convey information to USG agencies and departments. It is intended to improve their ability to work with complex problems that require coordinated effort. It can help achieve unity of effort in the pursuit of national objectives.

WHY do we need the Unity of Effort Framework?

Use of the Framework can help address complex challenges and improve unity of effort by revealing key intersections between USG agencies and departments. This helps coordinate their planning efforts and can reveal opportunities, threats, differing mission priorities, and authorities.

WHEN do we use the Unity of Effort Framework?

The Framework helps to plan for complex operations involving more than one USG agency or department to achieve national objectives. It provides a way to visualize components of complex interagency missions, thus improving the understanding of interagency interrelationships for a given operating area based on roles, responsibilities, and authorities. The Framework is intended as a way to improve unified action during steady-state planning.

HOW do we use the Unity of Effort Framework?

To understand and use the Framework, provided are this Solution Guide (consisting of techniques, procedures, terms, and a set of templates), a Quick Reference Pamphlet, a brochure, and a Joint Knowledge Online (JKO) course, J3OP-US1214 (see Appendix A).

Key Term

Unity of Effort: A cooperative concept which refers to coordination and communication among USG agencies toward the same common goals for success; in order to achieve unity of effort, it is not necessary for all agencies to be controlled under the same command structure (as with unity of command), but it is necessary for each agency's efforts to be in harmony with the short- and long-term goals of the mission. Unity of effort is based on four principles:

- Common understanding of the situation
- Common vision, goals, and objectives for the mission
- Coordination of efforts to ensure continued coherency
- Common measures of progress and ability to change course if necessary

The Framework occurs in three stages plus an optional follow-on stage as depicted in figure 1. The stages are conducted in sequential order. The time required to complete each stage depends on the complexity of the mission or problem set and participation of interagency stakeholders and mission partners.



Figure 1. Unity of Effort Framework Build Overview

STAGE 1: INITIATION

Guidance. The necessity for executing the Framework arises through normal planning or is initiated by higher-level guidance. The Framework may vary in complexity and scope. It may be a routine review of national-level guidance documents that require an update, a new national-level strategy that needs to be addressed and consequently coordinated across the USG, or it may be an assessment of world events that requires interagency efforts. Examples include security missions, stability operations, and humanitarian assistance/disaster relief (HA/DR).

Stakeholder and Mission Partner Identification. Stakeholders and mission partners are organizations, persons, or groups that have an investment, share, interest, or play an important part in the design and outcome of a stated issue, mission, or problem set. Their identification is determined by a review of higher-level policy, guidance, or strategy documentation. Send a formal request for participation to potential interagency stakeholders and mission partners. Include read-ahead material to allow them to understand the mission or problem set. Ideally, the request will come from higher department level and go to the secretariat level of other departments and agencies.



Figure 2. Potential Stakeholder Example for Stage 1

Key Term

Stakeholder or Mission Partner: Representatives with stated or implied functions, responsibilities and legal authorities related to a mission area. They may include non-governmental,

intergovernmental, and multi-national representatives.

Stage 1 Outcome. Identification of applicable national strategic guidance or other pertinent guidance, strategy, or policy documents; appointment of a coordination/facilitation group; identification of stakeholders and mission partners (establish a contact list); appropriately scoped mission or problem set; and formal requests sent to stakeholders and mission partners.

STAGE 2: BUILD A COMMON VIEW

Building a common view is achieved through collective identification and consensus of common objectives, a common operating environment, and common categories of effort by stakeholders and mission partners. They meet or provide information concerning their perspectives and interpretation of the mission area goals and objectives that will be analyzed and consolidated by the coordination/facilitation group into the Framework. Throughout stage 2, each stakeholder provides input for consideration. Once analyzed and agreed upon, the common objectives, a common operating environment, and common categories of effort are inserted into a three-dimensional view (see figure 3). Further, a common lexicon is established to ensure clear communication amongst stakeholders and mission partners.



Figure 3. Three-Dimensional View of the Framework

The Three-Dimensional View. A three-dimensional view may provide an effective way to visualize the interrelationship of common objectives, a common operating environment, and common categories of effort. This allows each stakeholder and mission partner to visualize the mission or problem set in a common way and may provide a means to communicate the scope of the problem or mission to senior leadership.

Identify Common Objectives. Common objectives are clearly defined, decisive and attainable goals toward which the operation is directed. They are developed within the context of existing U.S. national security and foreign policies, and are derived from higher-level guidance. While stakeholders may have different organizational perspectives, the Framework serves as a mechanism to reach an understanding of common objectives. Each stakeholder should review and conduct their own analysis to determine how they support the national level strategy, to include a review of national level goals and objectives as they relate to the identified problem set or mission area. Stakeholders and mission partners may also want to consider their agency or department internal goals (where applicable) as they relate to the problem set or mission area. The focus during this stage should be on the desired end states and reaching consensus on a common list of objectives that fit within the higher-level guidance documents.

Identify the Common Operating Environment. The common operating environment is a combination of conditions, surroundings, circumstances, and landscapes. The common operating environment can be interpreted in many ways: geographic region, sector, domain, critical terrain, key border crossings between nations, mountainous area, or land route. When identifying the common operating environment, each stakeholder should consider their organization's perspectives. However, it is important to reach consensus on the description of a common operating environment for the Framework.

Identify Common Categories of Effort. Common categories of effort are elements of national power or lines of effort. Elements of national power are ways the USG is able to use the political, economic, and military strengths of the U.S. in order to influence other states and non-state actors. They include development, diplomacy, economic, governance, information, intelligence, law enforcement, and military. For common categories of effort, stakeholders and mission partners may want to consider and review current international actions, Executive Orders, directives, and organizational abilities which influence, inform, or shape the intended end state. Various government departments, agencies, and individual stakeholder organizations may interpret the categories of effort differently, making it important to capture agreed upon definitions for each common category of effort.

Stage 2 Outcome. Stakeholder and mission partner reach consensus on a three-dimensional view of common objectives, common categories of effort, a common operating environment, and associated terms (a common lexicon).

STAGE 3: BUILDING A COMMON UNDERSTANDING

The completed three-dimensional view built during stage 2 is flattened into a matrix (spreadsheet format) incorporating all of the elements of earlier stages. The use of widely available software like Microsoft Excel or Access is encouraged, which allows ease of use amongst stakeholders and mission partners. The matrix consists of common objectives (on the left side), common operating environment (across the top), and common categories of effort (entered into the body of the matrix) at the intersections of common objectives and the common operating environment (see figure 4). The matrix allows stakeholders and mission partners to select multiple common categories of effort as needed for stage 3. The coordination/facilitation group will create the initial matrix, a spreadsheet template, and distribute it to stakeholders and mission partners so they may fill in the spreadsheet as part of the stage 3 process.



Figure 4. Framework Matrix to Be Populated with Data by Each Organization

Consolidated Input. Completing the matrix requires stakeholders and mission partners to choose a common objective, then reference each common operating environment and identify (in the light blue sections of the body of the matrix) which common categories of effort that are applied at the appropriate row and column intersection of common objectives and common operating environment. Stakeholders and mission partners should identify whether their organization has a Lead (L) or Contributing (C) role for each category of effort. Note that the term "Lead" may be unused in the Framework if it is not important to identify who is in charge or has coordinating authority for the mission or problem set. In these cases, all input should be listed as "Contributing" for that category of effort.

Key Terms

Lead (L): A Lead stakeholder or mission partner has responsibility to plan, conduct operations, coordinate, and lead the integrated USG effort involving those departments and agencies possessing capabilities and resources relevant to the mission or problem set. The lead organization may be determined by law (Title 50, Title 10), by directive (executive agent or lead federal agency designation), or by precedent in terms of established mission roles, responsibilities, and authorities. There can be multiple Leads identified in the Framework for multiple categories of effort.

Contributing (C): A stakeholder or mission partner that is executing, supporting, sharing, or otherwise involved and a part of the mission or problem set.

Ranking of Objectives and Environment. The ranking of objectives and the environment helps to identify major areas of effort or emphasis. Ranking can be based on an organization's established priorities, or it can be based on the volume of resources, programs, risk, or activities. Organizations may also prefer to highlight the intersections to indicate major areas of emphasis or effort.

Key Intersections. Key Intersections are those intersections that stakeholders and mission partners agree are the most important for planning and improving unity of effort. Selecting Key Intersections is best achieved through a face-to-face collaborative session with all stakeholders and mission partners participating. This type of session allows each organization to present their matrix input and

perspectives for shared understanding. Key Intersections are denoted by placing a star in the selected cells (see figure 5).

Key Term

Key Intersections: Those intersections that stakeholders and mission partners agree are the most important for planning and to improve unity of effort.

Examples of Key Intersection criteria:

- Cells where stakeholders and mission partners believe that more in-depth information sharing in an optional stage 4 (Deep Dive) analysis would be useful to improve unity of effort
- Cells where a large amount of activity is occurring
- Cells that the stakeholders and mission partners agree are most important to accomplishing the objective based on priorities, opportunities, or return of investment
- Cells that are high priority
- Cells that the stakeholders and mission partners agree are most important to accomplishing the objective based on the most pressing or emerging threats
- Total number of agencies contributing in a cell across the operational environment
- Total number of agencies that identified a cell as a major area of contribution through rank order
- Cells that reflect upcoming planning requirements

Consolidated Working Matrix	Operating Environment					
Common Objective 1			\bigstar			
Common Objective 2	\star					
Common Objective 3						
Common Objective 4						
Common Objective 5		\bigstar				
Common Objective 6						

Figure 5. Consolidated Matrix. Key Intersections Denoted by Stars

Stage 3 Outcome. Stakeholder and mission partners reach consensus on a consolidated matrix and identify Key Intersections for in-depth analysis in stage 4 (Deep Dive) (optional follow-on stage).

NOTE

For some missions or problem sets, the Framework may end at stage 3. Stage 4 in the Framework is useful only if additional work is desired or needed to identify capability/capacity gaps, coordinate activities, and/or develop specific recommendations to address inhibitors or impediments to unity of effort.

STAGE 4: COORDINATION OF EFFORT (THE DEEP DIVE) OPTIONAL FOLLOW-ON STAGE

Deep Dive. Stage 4 is useful only if additional work is desired or needed to identify capability/capacity gaps, coordinate activities, and/or develop specific recommendations to address inhibitors or impediments to unity of effort. This stage works best using a combined approach of online and face-to-face meetings between participating stakeholders and mission partners. The Deep Dive consists of an indepth examination of selected Key Intersections and focused information sharing to set the conditions for coordination and coherency. It is focused on capabilities ("what and why"), capacity ("where, when, and how often"), and activities ("how capabilities are being accomplished"). During the Deep Dive, stakeholders and mission partners will share information regarding their capabilities, capacities, and activities for the Key Intersections selected during stage 3. Figure 6 is a depiction of a Deep Dive template for a selected Key Intersection.

Select organization from dropdown menu											
Type organization in free text											
Key Intersection: Objective X, Operating Environment Y	Geor.	oulit.	Activi.	Office for	Contact	Supporting	lints Best p.	Parties	Recomments	^{rendations}	stre.
List first item											
List second item											
List third item											
Etc.											

Figure 6. Deep Dive Template

Deep Dive Activities. At this stage, similarities and differences in approach and timing will become apparent. Stakeholders and mission partners should discuss the frequency and duration of activities in terms of quantity and quality. When combined, information starts to emerge for planners to identify activities to coordinate where there are opportunities for strong interagency partnerships, redundancies or overlaps, gaps in support requirements, seams in the operating environments that are not being covered, and shortfalls in resources. Another important aspect of improving unity of effort is the ability to identify common measures of progress and to change course as necessary. Where appropriate, common measures of progress may be identified for each common objective or each selected Key Intersection as a projection of a desired end state. Common measures of progress represent high-level milestones or operating environment changes (good or bad) that could initiate another evaluation of USG goals and objectives. This should not be confused with measures of effectiveness or measures of performance.

Template Completion. The data for the stage 3 matrix selected Key Intersections is reviewed. Stakeholders are asked to complete the Deep Dive template for each category of effort where they are listed as Lead and/or Contributing. Using the template, each stakeholder enters the name of the Key Intersection and the information on capabilities, capacities, and activities across the row. Stakeholders and mission partners can add as many rows as needed, submitting their completed template to the coordination/facilitation group, which will examine the information and build a consolidated template. This template is presented during a collaborative meeting. Findings and recommendations developed through following the stages of the Framework are captured in a report or briefing to senior leaders (figure 7).

Output of Comparison & Contrast Review List identified redundancies List coordinated efforts List identified gaps List identified seams List identified shortfalls 	Deep Dive Follow-Up Stakeholder A Stakeholder B Stakeholder C Stakeholder E
 Output of Sufficiency Review Provide adequacy of activities Provide adequacy of quality of activities Provide adequacy of frequency of activities Provide adequacy of duration of activities 	Overall Review Similarities Identified Differences Identified Recommendations Identified

Figure 7. Report/Briefing to Senior Leaders

Stage 4 Outcome. Recommendations based on opportunities for strong interagency partnerships, redundancies or overlaps, gaps in support requirements, seams in the operating environment, and shortfalls in resources discovered during the Deep Dive; common measures of progress are determined as desired end states.

CHAPTER 4

EXECUTING THE UNITY OF EFFORT FRAMEWORK: Combating Transnational Organized Crime in the Western Hemisphere (C-TOC WHEM) CASE STUDY

CAVEAT: The intent of this Case Study is not to interfere with the ongoing authoritative interagency efforts to implement the July 2011 *Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime* that takes place through the Interagency Policy Committee (IPC) process, chaired by the National Security Staff. USNORTHCOM and USSOUTHCOM, as the project sponsors, selected C-TOC WHEM as the focus area for the Framework development in order to evaluate and refine a planning and coordination aid for improving interagency unity of effort.

Data depicted in the C-TOC WHEM Case Study does not necessarily represent the standard operating procedures and policies of the project participating stakeholders and mission partners. The data depicted is notional for example purposes only; it does not in any way reflect official policies of any USG department or agency.

NOTE: A sample of the data is included in this Case Study. If you wish to see the data in full, please send a request to the Joint Staff J7.

This Case Study describes the application of the Framework to the mission area of C-TOC WHEM. It was used to apply the Framework to the C-TOC mission and provides an example for planners using the *Unity of Effort Framework Solution Guide*. It describes the successes and challenges that the facilitation team faced in applying the Framework to the C-TOC WHEM mission over the course of eight months. Tips for planners are provided to facilitate understanding. Figure 8 illustrates the relationship between unity of effort principles (see chapter 3) and the four stages of the Framework. Each is explained using the C-TOC WHEM case study as an example.



Figure 8. Unity of Effort Framework Stages

STAGE 1: INITIATION AND STAKEHOLDER IDENTIFICATION

The necessity for executing the Framework arises through routine planning or is initiated by higher-level guidance. The Framework may vary in complexity and scope. It may be a routine review of national-level guidance documents that require an update, a new national-level strategy that needs to be addressed and consequently coordinated across the government, or it may be an assessment of world events that requires interagency efforts.

Executing the Framework necessitates stakeholder and mission partner identification. The U.S. Code (USC) (http://uscode.house.gov/) and the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (http://www.archives.gov/federal-register/cfr/) are sources that may help to identify roles and authorities of potential stakeholders and mission partners.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

Stage 1: Initiation and Stakeholder Identification

Determined by a specific national strategy or set of policies, the guiding document for the C-TOC mission was the *Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime* (July 2011) and subsequent implementation planning and reporting under the purview of the National Security Staff.

After reviewing the *Strategy for Combating Transnational Organized Crime*, the facilitation team conducted research to identify USG departments and agencies that have significant roles in C-TOC in the WHEM. The facilitation team contacted potential stakeholders at the department level for participation in the project.



Figure 9. Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime

The coordinator or facilitator is responsible for requesting interagency participation, scheduling and facilitating meetings, and requesting and collecting all information related to the Framework. Within DOD, this would normally be the CCMD J5 Theater Campaign or Theater Security Cooperation planners. Within Department of State (DOS), the Chief of Missions Key Strategic Planner might find this planning aid to be of significant benefit to achieve cross-government synergy. Within Department of Homeland Security (DHS), this might be DHS Headquarters Plans and Operations.

TIP: For the C-TOC WHEM Case Study, Joint Staff J7 served as the facilitation team. However, it is expected that an operational organization would normally serve as the facilitation team. In the case of the DOD, this would be the CCMD in support of their TCP or TSCP development.

Identification of stakeholders and mission partners comes from a review of higher-level policy, guidance, or strategy. It may also be an iterative process as the Framework develops, which may require additional or new stakeholders and mission partners to participate in later stages.

TIP: In some mission areas there are multiple national policies or strategies that should be reviewed to determine stakeholders and mission partners. For an example, see the USG Preparedness for Foreign Disaster Response document.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

After reviewing the *Strategy for Combating Transnational Organized Crime*, the facilitation team conducted research to identify USG departments and agencies that have significant roles in C-TOC WHEM (figure 10). The facilitation team made contacts at the department level for participation in the project.



Figure 10. Potential Stakeholders Example

Framework execution requires information collection and analysis at each stage. Several communication methods may assist in executing the Framework such as face-to-face meetings, collaborative online sessions, video teleconferences, chat tools, email, and stakeholder/mission partner access to an intranet. The preferred method of sharing information is a combination of both collaborative and face-to-face meetings with all stakeholders and mission partners. These meetings will solidify stakeholder relationships and assist in determining the periodicity of future communications. The project's completion time and scope drive the intensity and frequency of required planning coordination, determining needs, and identifying goals.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

For stage 1 of the C-TOC WHEM Case Study, dialogue with potential stakeholders and mission partners took place in the Washington D.C. area, where most of the theater/regional interagency program managers and desk officers are located. The facilitation team expected to conduct most meetings in the Washington D.C. area.

Continued→

C-TOC WHEM Case Study (continued)

Reaching out to potential stakeholders and mission partners to request their participation in the Case Study was an issue for the facilitation team. The issue was twofold: 1) determining the right point-of-contact and office for each stakeholder organization, and 2) legitimizing the effort for interagency participation. The first required numerous phone calls and meetings to identify the right points-of-contact within each stakeholder organization. The second area, legitimizing the effort, is very important to federal agencies in order to assure their leadership that the effort provides value to their organization and has senior leadership oversight within normal interagency processes. This may require a formal letter or request to interagency organizations from the facilitating organization. Without a formal request or acknowledgement of the effort, it may be difficult for civilian agencies to participate due to limited resources and personnel. To address these issues the facilitation team used a combination of four methods with varying success:

- The first method to engage the interagency was the use of the organizational liaison officers assigned to the CCMDs. This was a necessary first step to socialize the effort internal to the CCMD for participation or the identification of the appropriate point-of-contact. In most cases, organizational liaisons are not the right personnel with the needed expertise or background to participate in the Framework application. However, they can be the conduit back to their organization to get the needed expertise.
- The second method was using existing C-TOC forums and conferences to socialize the effort. This
 was successful in building a contact list of interagency personnel tasked with C-TOC missions.
 Briefing the effort at an interagency forum can also help in developing the appropriate
 partnerships.
- 3. The third method was to engage the appropriate Interagency Policy Committees (IPCs) and subcommittees. This was a challenge for the facilitation team. While individual members of the IPC were supportive, the organizational representative to the IPC must advocate and support the effort. In most cases within DOD, the representative to the IPC is OSD or the Joint Staff. The facilitation team was not able to brief the C-TOC IPC because DOD's policy on support for C-TOC missions was under development.
- 4. The fourth method was a direct letter via email from the Director, Joint Staff J7 to the other organizational leadership requesting their participation. Additionally, a video teleconference was conducted to explain the effort and answer questions.

Continuous collaboration, information collection, analysis, progress reporting, and information dissemination require persistence and effective time management skills, a facilitator function ensures planning goals are achieved and deadlines are met.

TIP: Engage with organizational leadership to help in legitimizing the Framework
 effort. For DOD, the best approach is to socialize the effort with organizational liaison
 officers, use existing forums to determine appropriate organizational contacts, and
 follow up with a letter from Joint Staff or OSD to officially request participation.

Effective time management is aided by facilitator skills, tools, techniques, and methods (allocation, setting goals, delegation, analysis of time use, monitoring, organizing, scheduling, and prioritizing). Table 1 is a checklist for conducting stage 1.

Table 1. Stage 1 Checklist

Task	Yes	No	Comments or Remarks
Appoint a coordination/facilitation group.			
Collect and post all pertinent guidance, strategy, and policy			
documents.			
Begin gathering reference documentation related to the mission			
or problem set.			
Stakeholders and mission partners agreed on an overarching			
high level document that will trigger or serve as the seminal			
document for this effort.			
Consider engaging the high headquarters for their support and			
awareness of the effort. For DOD this would be the Joint Staff			
and/or OSD.			
Send a formal request for participation in the effort to			
interagency stakeholders and mission partners. Ideally, the			
request will come from the higher department level and go to			
the secretariat level of other departments and agencies. For			
example, within DOD, Joint Staff or OSD may engage other			
departments and agencies through an Interagency Policy			
Committee (IPC) or as a direct request at the secretariat level.			
Identify stakeholders and mission partners. Begin a contact list.			
Invite stakeholders and mission partners to participate in a			
kickoff meeting. Include read-ahead material as appropriate.			
Capture assumptions or constraints that were made during			
stage 1.			
Determine the timeline for the effort.			
Appropriately scope the mission area or problem set.			

Figure 11 depicts a high-level activity model that highlights some of the activities, inputs, and outputs for stages 1 and 2 of the Framework. It also represents requirements in a high-level diagram to create a common view. Identification of common objectives, a common operating environment, and common categories of effort is explained under Stage 2: Build a Common View.



Figure 11. Stages 1 and 2 High-Level Activity Model

STAGE 2: BUILD A COMMON VIEW

Building a common view involves achieving collective identification and consensus of common objectives, a common operating environment, and common categories of effort amongst stakeholders and mission partners. Stakeholders and mission partners meet or provide information concerning their perspectives and interpretation of the mission area goals and objectives that will be analyzed and consolidated by the coordination or facilitation group for use in the Framework. Throughout stage 2, each stakeholder provides their input and the facilitation group consolidates the information for analysis. The coordination or facilitation group leads the review of the input to a get a consensus on the common view of the mission.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

Using the official request as a basis for participation, C-TOC WHEM stakeholders and mission partners had to build consensus on USG common objectives, categories of effort, and the operating environment. This stage is critical for determining the scope of the mission area, and is directly related to the first principle of unity of effort, a common view of the mission. We defined a common view as consensus on the USG objectives, operating environment, and categories of effort.

Stakeholders and mission partners were provided the *Strategy for Combating Transnational Organized Crime* as a reference. Each organization was asked to provide their input for USG common objectives, categories of effort, and the operating environment. The facilitation team collected and organized the input and presented them at a one day meeting for review and consensus in a tabletop format. The meeting required a strong facilitator with a good understanding of the Framework. The facilitator should expect disagreement and frustration as part of the learning process. This is normal and to be expected as stakeholders and mission partners share their input.

The facilitation team lead should be aware of the limited ability of organizations to support multi-day workshops or meetings. Try to keep the face-to-face meeting to one or two days by using preparatory teleconferences, video teleconferences (VTCs), and online meeting venues to prepare participants. Several preparatory one or two hour long online meetings will allow the face-to-face meeting to be more effective. The face-to-face meeting is important for discussing the different interpretations and meaning of each of the elements of the Framework. Terms of reference and definitions must be

TIP: Mission success is enhanced by positive personal relationships with stakeholders. Personal follow-up with stakeholders and mission partners by the facilitation team lead was important to gaining stakeholder participation. Each stakeholder was contacted by phone or in person. Most organizations and departments have multiple offices that may want to participate. Don't expect to find a centralized office. The facilitation team lead may have to reach out to multiple people within an organization before finding the right point-of-contact. Don't give up!

discussed and documented. Documentation of agreement on terms and definitions is important because one of the impediments to unity of effort is misunderstanding as a result of different lexicons.

TIP: Each Framework should contain documented terms and definitions agreed upon by all stakeholders related to the mission area. This will be important for stage 3 and the optional stage 4 of the Framework.

TIP: At this stage, the stakeholders and mission partners should be viewing the mission objectives from a national perspective. Ask stakeholders and mission partners to take off their organizational hat and put on a USG hat for the discussion.

Identify Common Objectives

While stakeholders may have different organizational perspectives, the Framework serves as a mechanism to reach an understanding of common objectives. Each stakeholder should conduct and review their own analysis to determine how they support the national level strategy, to include a review of national level goals and objectives as they relate to the identified problem set or mission. Stakeholders and mission partners may also want to consider their agency or department internal goals (where applicable) as they relate to the problem set or mission. The focus during this stage should be on the desired USG end states.

Key Term

Common Objective: A statement of the condition or state one expects to achieve. It is a clearly defined, decisive, and attainable goal toward which every action is directed. Common objectives are developed within the context of existing U.S. national security and foreign policies, and are derived from higher-level guidance.

For presentation, the common objectives are inserted into a three-dimensional view as depicted in figure 12. Stakeholders and mission partners should conduct the same process for the remaining aspects of this phase, identifying the common operating environment and common categories of effort.



Figure 12. Common Objectives Activity Model

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

The *Strategy for Combating Transnational Organized Crime* outlines five national objectives. These were selected as the common objectives for the Framework. At the one day meeting, the group discussed various interpretations of the objectives. Some of the objectives were compounded and the stakeholders and mission partners decided to split up some of the objectives in order to address each aspect separately in later stages of the Framework (figure 13).

Emerging Threats 1. Penetration of State Institutions, Corruption, and Threats to Governance 2. Threats to Economy, US Competitiveness, & Strategic Markets 3. Crime-Terror-Insurgency Nexus 4. Expansion of Drug Trafficking 5. Human Smuggling 6. Trafficking in Persons 7. Weapons Trafficking 8. Intellectual Property Theft 9. Cybercrime	Objectives 1. Protect Americans and our partners from harm, violence and exploitation of transnational criminal networks. 2. Help partner countries strengthen governance and transparency, break the corruptive power of TOC networks, and sever state-crime relationships. 3. a) Break the economic power of transnational criminal networks. b) Protect strategic markets and the U.S.	Elements of National Power • Diplomatic + Engagement • Development • Information • Military • Economic • Financial • Intelligence • Law Enforcement
10.Critical Role of Facilitators	 financial system. 4. Defeat TOC networks that pose the greatest threat to national security: a) Target Infrastructure. b) Deprive TCO of enabling means. c) Prevent criminal facilitation of terrorist activities. 5. Build (to defeat transnational organized crime): a) International consensus. b) Multilateral cooperation. c) Public-private partnerships. 	 Categories: International Engagement Intelligence & Info Sharing State, Local, & Private Sector Engagement Training & Capacity Building Operations & Programs

Figure 13. Detailed Collection of Information for the Framework

Identify the Common Operating Environment

Identifying the common operating environment will provide an improved understanding of organizational roles, responsibilities, and authorities based on geographic or operational boundaries. The common operating environment is the most flexible axis of the Framework and should be tailored to the problem set or mission and can be viewed in various ways. Some examples of a common operating environment are geographic regions, sectors, domains, countries, states, critical terrain, border crossings between nations, mountainous areas, and sea/air/land routes. Each of these examples
is a form of identifying a location or area where activities occur that relate to the problem set or mission. Based on the mission or problem set, stakeholders and mission partners may need to be more specific when identifying the operating environment such as sub-regions, portfolios, seaports, bridges, roadways, waterways, airfields, and air corridors. It should be noted that this is not an exhaustive list of areas for consideration. When identifying common operating environments for the Framework, each stakeholder should consider their organization's perspectives. The common operating environments, agreed upon by stakeholders and mission partners, are inserted into a three-dimensional view as depicted in figure 14.



Figure 14. Common Operating Environment Activity Model

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

The operating environment for the C-TOC case study was the WHEM. The group determined the primary regions and countries to consider within the WHEM. There was a discussion during the one day meeting on alternative environment categorizations using domains (land, air, sea, cyber, etc.) or threats (human smuggling, drug trafficking, weapons trafficking, etc). The determining factor was the ability to differentiate roles, responsibilities, and authorities in the operating environment. The use of domains and threats was considered but did not provide the distinction needed.

In the end, stakeholders and mission partners agreed to using geography to describe the operating environment (figure 15).



Figure 15. The WHEM as Defined by Stakeholders and Mission Partners

TIP: Make sure the operating environment is distinct from the common objectives and provides the ability to differentiate roles, responsibilities, and authorities for each area. For DOD, this is usually geographic locations.

Identify Common Categories of Effort

For common categories of effort, stakeholders and mission partners may want to consider and review current international actions, Executive Orders, and directives. They may also review organizational abilities which influence, inform, or shape the intended end state. Various government departments, agencies, and individual stakeholder organizations may interpret the common categories of effort differently. Constructs may include:

- Diplomacy, Information, Military, Economic, Financial, Intelligence, Law Enforcement (DIMEFIL)
- International Engagement, Intelligence and Information Sharing, State, Local, and Private Sector Engagement, Training and Capacity Building, and Operations & Programs
- Political, Military, Economic, Social, Infrastructure, and Information

Common categories of effort do not need to correspond to any one agency's guidance; the understanding of the agreed upon common categories of effort should be sufficient to allow mapping of all agencies' initiatives. Additionally, the Framework allows the flexibility to add or remove elements as necessary.

It is necessary to reconcile conflicting stakeholder interpretations to establish consensus on a list of common categories of effort, one that is flexible enough for all organizations to use. The common categories of effort, agreed upon by stakeholders and mission partners, are inserted into a three-dimensional view of as depicted in figure 16 and captured in the Key Terms and Definitions.





A three-dimensional view is one way to visualize the interrelationships of the common objectives, common operating environments, and common categories of effort. Important informational tools begin to take shape during stages 1 and 2 that provide planners valuable information (see figure 17). These include:

- A contact list of stakeholders and mission partners
- A list of organizational roles, responsibilities, and authorities
- A map of the operating environment
- Key terms and definitions supporting a common lexicon



Elements of National Power	Abbreviation
Elements of National Tower	Abbieviation
Development	Dev
Diplomatic + Engagement	D+E
Economic	Econ
Financial	Fin
Governance	Gov
Information	Info
Intelligence	Intel
Law Enforcement	LE
Military	Mil

DHS Categories	Abbreviation
International Engagement	IE
Intelligence & Information Sharing	1&IS
State, Local & Private Sector	S&L&PSE
Engagement	
Training & Capacity Building	T&CB
Operations & Programs	O&P

Figure 17. Identifying Categories of Effort for C-TOC WHEM

These tools are critical to provide reference and understanding for stakeholders and mission partners as the Framework stages are executed.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

As a starting point, the facilitation team presented the use of DIMEFIL elements of national power for the categories of effort. The appropriate categories of effort will depend on the mission, common objectives, and the operating environment. The stakeholders and mission partners expanded the DIMEFIL construct to include governance and engagement. Ideally, all stakeholders and mission partners should reach agreement on the categories of effort before moving forward. However, the Framework is flexible and evolves through the stages. As the stakeholders and mission partners moved into stage 3, the facilitation team was informed by DHS that they had used an internal C-TOC working group to organize their C-TOC implementation plan around five different but related categories of effort, and mapped their efforts using the six priority actions from the *Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime*. To include DHS's previous work, the Framework was modified to include their organizing construct (figure 17). This complicated the Framework but was accepted by stakeholders and helped with common understanding. It also showed the flexibility needed for federal interagency participation.

It is important to point out that not all C-TOC stakeholders and mission partners participated in the Framework effort. This may have been a result of lack of resources or higher priorities. It should be expected that the Framework does not need to be 100% complete or have 100% stakeholder involvement to be of value. To mitigate this challenge, the facilitation team continued to apply the Framework with those organizations that participated. Another option is to attempt to fill in information regarding roles, responsibilities, and authorities for missing stakeholders and mission partners using research or interviews. All assumptions should be documented. For this C-TOC WHEM Case Study, participating stakeholders and mission partners included departments and agencies from DHS, DOD, Department of Justice (DOJ), and Department of State (DOS).

Table 2 is a checklist to assist the coordination or facilitation group for conducting stage 2.

Table 2. Stage 2 Checklist

Task	Yes	No	Comments or Remarks
Prepare and present an overview brief of the effort for			
stakeholders and mission partners. Include their perspectives.			
Capture assumptions or constraints made during this stage.			
Update contact info for any new stakeholders and mission			
partners. If needed, send a formal request for participation in			
the overall effort.			
Begin to document stakeholder organizational roles,			
responsibilities, and authorities.			
Stakeholders and mission partners agree on common objectives			
and develop good descriptions or definitions for each.			
Stakeholders and mission partners agree on and establish			
definitions for the common categories of effort.			
Stakeholders and mission partners agree on and establish			
definitions for each of the common operating environments.			
Develop a map (if applicable).			
Create the three-dimensional view of common objectives,			
categories of effort, and the operating environment.			
Capture and define all mission specific terms (lexicon) (this is			
very important for later stages).			
Establish a collaborative working space that all stakeholders and			
mission partners can access and post all stages 1 and 2 data for			
reference.			

STAGE 3: BUILDING A COMMON UNDERSTANDING

After initiation (stage 1) and building of a common view (stage 2), the next step to improving unity of effort is building a common understanding (stage 3).

The completed three-dimensional view from stage 2 is flattened into a matrix (spreadsheet format) that incorporates all of the elements of earlier stages. The use of widely available software like Microsoft Excel or Access is encouraged, which allows ease of use amongst stakeholders and mission partners. The matrix consists of common objectives (on the left side), common operating environments (across the top), and common categories of effort (entered into the body of the matrix) at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments. The matrix allows stakeholders and mission partners to select multiple common categories of effort as needed for stage 3. As depicted in figure 18, the coordination or facilitation group will create the initial matrix (a spreadsheet template) and distribute it to stakeholders and mission partners so they may fill in the spreadsheet as part of the stage 3 process. Figure 19 depicts a matrix with C-TOC WHEM objectives and operating environments.



Figure 18. Completed Three-Dimensional View Converted into a Matrix for Stakeholder Input



*For experimentation purposes only; not authoritative.

Figure 19. C-TOC WHEM Organizational Matrix

Each stakeholder is asked to complete a matrix. The facilitation group will consolidate all input received from stakeholders. Completing the matrix with base information requires stakeholders and mission partners to enter the name of their organization at the top of the matrix. This helps the coordination or facilitation group identify the owner of the information during the consolidation and analysis steps. If a stakeholder chooses to have subordinate organizations or components provide information, they may provide additional matrix spreadsheets.

Stakeholders and mission partners choose a common objective, then reference each common operating environment and use the dropdown menu (the light blue sections in the body of the matrix) to identify which common categories of effort that are applied at the appropriate row and column intersection of common objectives and common operating environment. For each common category of effort, the stakeholder should identify whether their organization has a Lead (L) role or a Contributing (C) role.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

Stakeholders and mission partners were asked to review and fill in information related to their organization for each matrix cell pertaining to categories of effort. Additionally, they were asked to indicate whether they were a lead agency or a contributing agency for that category, and to rank the objectives and regions based on the priority their agency placed on that objective or region. Part of this process was for each stakeholder to review the documented organizational roles, responsibilities, and authorities captured and provided by the facilitation team.

This work was conducted using online meetings, teleconferences, and email. Once all stakeholders and mission partners submitted their data, the facilitation group aggregated the information to create a consolidated, comprehensive view. This view highlighted areas of significant USG activities in the operating environments. The facilitation team then hosted a two day face-to-face meeting in a tabletop format where stakeholders and mission partners presented their input to the group for common understanding.

During this meeting, stakeholders and mission partners developed and agreed on criteria for identification of Key Intersections. Key Intersections are intersections where a large amount of USG activity is occurring and where stakeholders and mission partners think that more in-depth information sharing in a stage 4 analysis would be useful to improve unity of effort and coordinate planning. Within DOD, Key Intersections may represent areas for the intermediate military objectives within a CCMD TCP. The criteria used for identifying Key Intersections for C-TOC WHEM included:

- 1. The matrix cells the stakeholders and mission partners agreed are most important to accomplishing the common objectives based on priorities, threats/opportunities, return of investment, and authorities.
- 2. Total number of agencies contributing in a cell across the operational environment.
- 3. Total number of agencies that identified a cell as a major area of contribution.
- 4. Cells representing significant lead and contributing roles, responsibilities, and authorities across the interagency.
- 5. Identification of a lack of interagency activity in a cell. Does the cell need to be addressed?

Based on these criteria, seventeen Key Intersections were identified in the Framework. Due to time limitations, the stakeholders and mission partners chose three intersections for further analysis that would occur in stage 4 of the Framework process (figure 18).

Continued→

C-TOC WHEM Case Study (continued)

- Mexico (objective 2): Help partner countries strengthen governance and transparency, break the corruptive power of TOC networks, and sever state-crime relationships.
- Central America (objective 2): Help partner countries strengthen governance and transparency, break the corruptive power of TOC networks, and sever state-crime relationships.
- Caribbean (objective 4): Defeat TOC networks that pose the greatest threat to national security by targeting their infrastructure, depriving transnational criminal organizations of enabling means, and prevent criminal facilitation of terrorist activities.

Using Microsoft Excel required creativity in the display of information. The red stars in figure 20 represent the selected Key Intersections. The yellow highlights represent cells where three organizations had a major contribution indicated by the "-1" after the organization name. The orange cells represent where two organizations had a major contribution indicated by the "-1". Bold lettering indicates a lead role in one or more category of effort.

Consolidated C-TOC WHEM Organizational Matrix*	Canada	United States	Comessic Borders (Merico 1369	Southern Cone	Andie an Aegion	Contral America	Carlibbean	Allanue	Pacific	Clobal
Objective 1-Protect Americans and our partners	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	3 DHS-1 DOD-1 DOJ-1	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	2 DHS-1 DOJ DOD-1
Objective 2 –Help partner countries strengthen governance and transparency	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DHS		DOS DHS-1	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	0 DHS	0 DHS	0 DHS DOJ DOD
Objective 3a –Break the economic power of transnational criminal networks	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	2 DOJ DHS-1 DOD-1	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DHS-1	1 DHS-1	2 DHS-1 DOJ DOD-1
Objective 3b –Protect strategic markets and the U.S. financial system	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DHS	0 DHS	1 DHS-1 DOJ
Objective 4a –Target transnational criminal networks Infrastructure	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	3 DHS-1 DOJ-1 DOD-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	1 DOS DHS DOJ-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	0 DHS DOJ DOD	0 DHS DOJ DOD	2 DHS-1 DOJ DOD-1
Objective 4b –Deprive transnational criminal networks of enabling means	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	3 DHS-1 DOJ-1 DOD-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	DOS DHS-1	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	2 DHS-1 DOJ DOD-1
Objective 4c –Prevent criminal facilitation of terrorist activities	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	2 DH5-1 DOJ-1 DOD	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	2 DOS DHS-1 DOJ-1	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD
Objective 5a –Build international consensus	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DHS DOD	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	0 DHS DOJ DOD
Objective 5b –Build multilateral cooperation	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	0 DOS DHS DOJ	1 DOS DHS-1 DOJ	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	1 DHS-1 DOJ DOD	0 DHS DOJ DOD
Objective 5c —Build public-private partnerships	0 DOS DHS	2 DHS-1 DOJ-1	0 DOS DHS DOD	0 DOS DHS DOD	0 DOS DHS DOD	0 DOS DHS DOD	0 DOS DHS DOD	0 DOS DHS	0 DHS	0 DHS	0 DHS
*Not authoritative; for experimentation purposes only.										•	
★ Selected Key Intersections											
Yellow Highlighted Cells: 3 or more organizations have	a major cont	ribution	1								

Yellow Highlighted Cells: 3 or more organizations have a major contribution Orange Highlighted Cells: 2 or more organizations have a major contribution



At the end of stage 3, all stakeholders and mission partners should have a common understanding of how the interagency as a whole is addressing the mission area and where they fit in as leading or contributing to that overall effort. See the Key Intersection example in figure 21 which provides a snapshot of the organizational information by category of effort. This information is necessary to focus the information sharing requirements for stage 4 of the Framework. By this point, interagency personnel will have built partnerships and have points-of-contact to work with for deeper, more meaningful information sharing and coordination.

Objective 2 – Help partner countries strengthen governance and transparency, break the corruptive power of transnational criminal networks, and sever state- crime alliances.	Mexico	-DF Key ma by -DC (L) for	lected Key Inter eragency Deep I nning. IS and DOD des Intersection as jor contribution colored stars. DS, DHS and DO. roles as indicate at in one or more egories/lines of	Dive ignated this an area of as indicated J have Lead ed by bold e					
ORG	Development	Diplomatic + Engagement	Economic	Financial	Governance	Information	intel	Law Enforcement	Military
DOS	Lead	Lead	Lead	Contribute	Lead	Lead	Contribute	Contribute	Lead
DOJ	N/A	Contribute	N/A	N/A	Contribute	N/A	N/A	Lead	N/A
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Contribute	Contribute	N/A	Contribute
DHS Plan	International Engagement	Intelligence and Information Sharing	State, Local and Private sector Engagement	Training and Capacity Building	Operations & Programs				
ICE	Lead	Lead	Lead	Lead	Lead			Key Intersection	☆
USCG	Contribute	Contribute	N/A	Contribute	Lead			DHS Major Contr	ibution 📩
СВР	Lead	Lead	Lead	Lead	Lead			DOJ Major Contr	
	C 1 1 1	Caratatinata	Contribute	N/A	Contribute				
USSS	Contribute	Contribute	Contribute	N/A	contribute			DOD Major Cont	ribution 🛧

Figure 21. Key Intersection Example (Stage 3) (Data is notional)

Stakeholders and mission partners may only be able to identify if they have a Lead status within their organizations and not be able to say if they are the designated Lead federal agency (the Remarks section is used to clarify these points). Each stakeholder can select as many common categories of effort they feel necessary, based on Lead or Contributing roles for each intersection. The matrix allows for entry of multiple common categories of effort. If an organization does not have a Lead or Contributing role for the selected common objective and common operating environment intersection, it should be left blank.



The matrix also provides a means to prioritize and identify your organization's areas of "Major Contribution" or priority of effort for the common objectives and the common operating environments.

Key Term

Major Contribution: An organization that has a major contribution is significantly involved in planning, coordinating, or performing tasks necessary to accomplish objectives.

To identify the "Major Contribution" areas, the stakeholder should rank the common objectives and the common operating environments utilizing internal guidance, implementation plans, or other appropriate documents. The selection of "Major Contribution" should also consider each stakeholder's organizational priorities, return on investment, authorities, opportunities, and vulnerabilities at that intersection. To assist in identifying areas of major contribution, the matrix provides for a numbering system to rank order the rows and columns of the common objectives and the common operating environments. The importance of this step depends on the mission or problem set. The activity model flow of completing stage 3 is depicted in figure 22.

After each stakeholder provides input, the facilitation group will consolidate the completed and prioritized matrices into a master matrix view to help visualize the interrelationships of Lead and Contributing organizations. This also provides the basis for a common view of the mission or problem set and the identification of Key Intersections. This is depicted in figure 23. This will streamline efforts and assist in identification of the Deep Dive focus areas (stage 4), if desired or necessary. When examined together, this may begin to uncover high-level gaps, shortfalls, and redundancies that need to be addressed in order to improve unity of effort. It may also help to identify areas that become intermediate objectives for deeper planning. A checklist of the generic Framework steps of stage 3 is provided in table 3.



Figure 22. Completing the Framework Stage 3 Matrix and Cells



Figure 23. Completed Stakeholder Input to Consolidated Matrix

Table 3. Stage 3 Checklist

Update the overview briefing from stage 2 and reset the baseline with stakeholders and mission partners. Image: Constant of the stakeholders and mission partners. Update contact information for any new stakeholders and mission partners. Image: Constant of the stakeholders and mission partners participating in this stage on all previous decisions, definitions, and references. Explain Framework terms Lead, Contributing, and Key Intersections. Image: Construct of the stakeholders and mission partners participating in the stage on all previous decisions, definitions, and references. Explain Framework terms Lead, Contributing, and Key Intersections. Image: Construct of the stage of the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix. Give stakeholders and mission partners enough time to gather	
Update contact information for any new stakeholders and mission partners. Brief new stakeholders and mission partners participating in this stage on all previous decisions, definitions, and references. Explain Framework terms Lead, Contributing, and Key Intersections. Create the matrix spreadsheet template. To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
mission partners. Image: Contribution of the matrix cells. Brief new stakeholders and mission partners participating in this stage on all previous decisions, definitions, and references. Image: Contribution of the matrix of the matrix spread of the matrix spread of the matrix spread of the matrix spread of the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Create the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
Brief new stakeholders and mission partners participating in this stage on all previous decisions, definitions, and references. Explain Framework terms Lead, Contributing, and Key Intersections. Create the matrix spreadsheet template. To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
stage on all previous decisions, definitions, and references. Explain Framework terms Lead, Contributing, and Key Intersections. Create the matrix spreadsheet template. To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
Explain Framework terms Lead, Contributing, and Key Intersections. Create the matrix spreadsheet template. To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
Intersections. Create the matrix spreadsheet template. To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
Create the matrix spreadsheet template. Image: Create the matrix spreadsheet template. To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Image: Create template is a constrained of the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
To begin the information request, conduct a teleconference or online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
online meeting to explain the matrix, roles, responsibilities, and authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
authorities. Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
Send the information request with instructions for stakeholders and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
and mission partners to fill in the matrix cells. Identify Lead and Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
Contributing organizations by common categories of effort at the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
the intersections of common objectives and common operating environments in the matrix.	
environments in the matrix.	
Give stakeholders and mission partners enough time to gather	
and submit the data (approximately four weeks on average).	
Capture any new mission specific terms and definitions.	
Capture stakeholder changes to organizational roles,	
responsibilities, and authorities.	
Review stakeholder input and follow up if there is missing or	
incomplete information.	

Continued→

Table 3. Stage 3 Checklist (continued)

Task	Yes	No	Comments or Remarks
Using the stakeholder provided information, merge the data into			
a consolidated view. This may require combining component			
views into department level (Examples: CCMDs, National Guard,			
and Joint Staff might roll up into a DOD representation in the			
consolidated view).			
Request stakeholders and mission partners present their input			
to each other at a meeting to improve common understanding.			
Review and discuss the consolidated view with stakeholders and			
mission partners in preparation for Key Intersection selection.			
Capture any insights or discoveries that emerge from the matrix			
data. Identify problem areas, disconnects, and processes that			
mpeded common understanding.			
Capture assumptions or constraints that were made during stage			
3 (Example: If a key stakeholder is not able to participate, the			
effort may move forward by using assumptions that can be			
addressed at a later date).			
Develop a set of criteria to select Key Intersections based on			
stakeholder consensus.			
Meeting with stakeholders and mission partners (preferably			
face-to-face), select Key Intersections and indicate locations in			
the matrix.			
Post all stage 3 data on a collaborative worksite (intranet) that			
all stakeholders and mission partners can access.			
Discuss the next steps and information requirements for the			
stage 4 Deep Dive (if desired or deemed necessary).			

STAGE 4: DEEP DIVE PLANNING (AN OPTIONAL FOLLOW-ON STAGE)

Optional follow-on stage 4 works best using a combined approach of online and face-to-face meetings between participating stakeholders and mission partners. The Deep Dive consists of an in-depth examination of selected Key Intersections and focused information sharing to set the conditions for coordination and coherency. During the Deep Dive, stakeholders and mission partners will share information regarding their capabilities, capacities, and activities for the Key Intersections selected in stage 3.

Key Term

Deep Dive: The Deep Dive occurs during the optional follow-on stage 4 of the Framework. It is an in-depth examination of a selected cell in the matrix primarily focused on capabilities ("what and why"), capacity ("where, when, and how often"), and activities ("how capabilities are being accomplished").

At this stage, the focus is on activities and capabilities. Similarities and differences in approach and timelines will start to emerge. Stakeholders and mission partners should also discuss the frequency and duration of activities in terms of quantity and quality. Additional information such as responsible organization, contact information (phone, email, Internet address), supporting documentation or links, best practices, impediments (e.g., policy, authority issues), and recommendations will be helpful in the Deep Dive analysis and later de-confliction and coordination.

TIP: It would be beneficial and important for stakeholder operational-level planners to keep the agency execution-level planner informed of the Framework process taking place for two reasons: 1) keep them informed so they know what is taking place, and 2) they are a valuable resource for the activities taking place in their operational environment.

Completing the Deep Dive template for each of the Key Intersection requires stakeholders and mission partners to provide information concerning capabilities, capacity, and activities for each category of effort where they indicated a Lead or Contributing role (as identified in stage 3). When combined, information starts to emerge for planners to identify activities to coordinate where there are opportunities for strong interagency partnerships, redundancies or overlaps, gaps in support requirements, seams in the operating environments that are not being covered, and shortfalls in resources.

Using the template, each stakeholder or mission partner enters the name of the Key Intersection and the information on capabilities, capacities, and activities across the row as depicted in figure 23. Stakeholders and mission partners can add as many rows as needed. Stakeholders and mission partners submit their completed template to the coordination or facilitation group, who will examine the information and build a consolidated template for all stakeholders and mission partners. This template will be presented during a collaborative meeting.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

The facilitation team requested that stakeholders and mission partners provide information for each of the categories of effort from stage 3. For example, if DOS had Lead for diplomacy in Mexico for objective 2, then they were asked to provide more information on what, where, when, and how the diplomacy is being conducted. It is important the stakeholders have a clear understanding of what information is being requested in the data call. Facilitators must be specific as possible such as purpose, scope, requirement or activity type, organizational level, timeframe, organizational prioritization and risk as examples. They were also asked to provide point-ofcontact and supporting plans, programs, or initiative background information. At this point in the Framework process, stakeholder participation may shift from a management, operational level, regional bureau, or desk officer perspective to the "on the ground" planners and subject matter experts.

The stakeholders and mission partners were given approximately three weeks to provide input. In most cases, the information provided from stakeholders and mission partners was late or incomplete. This may have been due to not having enough time or not enough background on the purpose of the data request. Within DOD, the request was sent out as a Joint Staff Action Package (JSAP) to USNORTHCOM, USSOUTHCOM, USSOCOM, and National Guard Bureau (NGB). The facilitation team lead sent a request to DHS, DOJ, and DOS points-of-contact to provide information. It is recommended that the request for information be fully explained and that enough time is given to allow for data collection. Figure 24 is an example of one completed worksheet (unclassified data sheets are available upon request).

TIP: Be sure to give enough time for organizations to research and gather requested information. Requests should come from organizational leadership. At this stage, don't expect to get good data without a formal request.

C.I	- (- D - 1									
	tion from Dropdown I									
	of Justice - DOJ									
	on in Free Text Belo									
Key Intersection:	DEA		4			2010			-	
Objective 4(b), Caribbean (Defeat transnational criminal networks that pose the greatest threat to estimate convitin be	and the second	State of the second				Second Se				
DOJ DEA	investigate the highest level TOCs in their ADR	investigative unit in each country capable of identifying and investigating drug trafficking TOCs and their related financial activities. Each CO must identify at least two Special Agent	training and provide periodic advanced training in both topics	Caribbean Division Country Offices, in coordinatio n with DEA Academy Internation al Training Section		a) SIU SOPP	Work with State Departmen t to obtain CBSI funding, if available	corruption, HN resistance to close relationship with US	a) Push to sign formal Letter of Agreement (LOA's) with host country	
DOJ DEA		assist HN to develop a robust criminal	conduct basic intelligence analysis training	Caribbean Division Country	Caribbean Division Country	NA	NA	Corruption. In many countries,		
DOJDEA	capacity to self-	a) assist HN to develop a robust initial entry and	a) leverage expertise at the DEA Academy, DOJ	a) Caribbean Division	Caribbean Division Country	NA	NA			
DOJ DEA	to securely share investigative	assist HN to develop a secure, web-based system of information sharing	a) utilize existing DEA program known as CDI to encourage HIN to share information with regional partners, creating a more robust investigative	Caribbean Division Country Offices, in coordinatio n with DEA HQS Intelligenc e Division	Caribbean Division Country Offices	NA	NA	Corruption. Reluctance to share information intelligence with other countries that they believe to		
DOJDEA	to communicate	modern portable	utilizing DEA and interagency, provide HN with	Caribbean Country Offices,	Caribbean Country Offices, DEA	NA	NA	funding, maintenanc e	utilization of DOD communic	
DOJ DEA	capability	assist HN to develop a sufficient air and sea	utilize DOD and interagency partner to train and equip	Caribbean Country Offices	Caribbean Country Offices	NA	NA	funding, extensive training and	utilization of DOD ain/maritim	
DOJ DEA	Build HN capacity to target TOCs electronic	assist HN to procure, maintain and utilize	utilize DOD and interagency partner to train and equip	Caribbean Country Offices	Caribbean Country Offices and	NA	NA	corruption issues, resistance	utilization of DEA experts	

Figure 24. Example of a Completed Worksheet (Data is notional)

Prior to the face-to-face collaborative session, the coordination or facilitation group will review information from stages 1, 2, and 3 to ensure traceability and continuity. The review will cover previous agreements on initial gaps, shortfalls, and redundancies to ensure the stage 4 Deep Dive begins from a common understanding. This review forms the starting point for the face-to-face collaborative session.

The coordination or facilitation group guides a discussion to achieve coherency among stakeholders and mission partners. "Comparison" focuses on similarities and commonality supporting the identification of potential redundancies. "Contrast" focuses on how they differ from each other in supporting the identification of gaps, seams, and shortfalls. A sufficiency discussion will follow within the context of mission accomplishment ("sufficiency" refers to the adequacy of quantity, quality, frequency, and duration).

The coordination or facilitation group solicits recommendations, based on the information provided from each focused (Key Intersection) small group that may address gaps, seams, shortfalls, and

redundancies. These recommendations may fall within a single organizational purview or may require a higher decision authority as determined by each organization's decision maker. Figure 24 depicts Deep Dive small group output examples.



Figure 25. Stage 4 Deep Dive Small Group Output Examples

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

During the C-TOC WHEM Case Study, the facilitation team conducted several weekly teleconferences leading up to a two day face-to-face meeting designed as a limited objective experiment. Stakeholders and mission partners were asked to send subject matter experts who work specifically in the three Key Intersections. New participants required an in-depth overview of the Framework in order to contribute effectively. An overview briefing was provided but did not go into enough detail on roles, responsibilities, and authorities or definitions of key terms. As a result, the ability to identify areas and opportunities for coordination and de-confliction was limited. However, the teams were able to share high-level information and produced a back brief on their results. Because of the timeline for the Case Study, the facilitation team did not conduct a full stage 4 application for all Key Intersections. This is an area of the Framework that should be further developed through application and additional case studies.

Coordination of Planning Events

Coordination of planning events lays out the execution of planning activities, events, and plans of action and milestones (POA&M) linked to or are required to achieve objectives over time and space. While this will cover the selected timeframe (0 - n years), there will be links to future years and beyond. Coordination may also foster increased capability by increasing degrees of integration achieved through de-confliction, coordination, and implementation of planning events. Planners may conduct a coordination forum with stakeholders and mission partners for interagency staffing, review, and contributions to the operational planning of other agencies.

Common Measures of Progress

Another important aspect of improving unity of effort is the ability to identify common measures of progress and to change course as necessary. Where appropriate, common measures of progress may be identified for each common objective or for each selected Key Intersection as a projection of a desired end state. Common measures of progress represent high-level milestones or operating environment changes (good or bad) that could initiate another evaluation of USG goals and objectives. This should not be confused with measures of effectiveness or measures of performance.

Due to the limited time to conduct the Case Study, measures of progress for C-TOC WHEM were not fully developed. This is an area of the Framework that should be further developed through application and additional case studies.

Key Term

Measure of Progress: A standard by which an attribute is recorded that suggests beneficial advancement of something with respect to a point in time.

Planners may wish to refer to the U.S. Institute for Peace publication, *Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE): A Metrics Framework*, which guides practitioners through a metrics system to address measures of progress.

• There has been a longstanding need for measures of progress focused on diplomatic, military, and development efforts.

- Traditionally, USG agencies have tended to measure outputs, such as the number of schools built, miles of roads paved, or numbers of insurgents killed. Outputs, however, measure what we do but not what we achieve.
- Outcomes or end states (also sometimes referred to as "impacts," "effects," or "results") indicate the success or failure of projects or missions.

C-TOC WHEM Case Study

The C-TOC WHEM Case Study attempted to capture some of the challenges and issues related to application of the Framework and how the project team, stakeholders, and mission partners responded to overcome or mitigate challenges. This Case Study represents one application of the Framework. Each application will be unique depending on the mission, common objectives, and operating environment. The Framework must remain flexible and adaptable to the needs of the stakeholders and mission partners while still providing an organizing structure for improving unity of effort. The principles of unity of effort are only achieved through partnerships and relationships amongst stakeholders and mission partners. The Joint Staff J7 thanks all who participated in this Case Study and sincerely hopes for continued partnerships toward improving unity of effort across the interagency.

Common measures of progress are important for unity of effort to determine if the activities are effective in meeting objectives over time. They represent high-level milestones or operating environment conditions and support identification of changes in the environment that initiate a re-evaluation of the Framework's priorities and Key Intersections. Establishing common measures of progress provides the ability to change course if necessary. Table 4 is a stage 4 checklist of example Framework steps.

Task	YES	NO	Comments or Remarks
Update the overview briefing and reset baseline with any new			
stakeholders and mission partners.			
Conduct an in-depth review of all data, information, agreements,			
definitions, roles, responsibilities, authorities, and references to			
bring new stakeholders and mission partners to a common			
understanding. Explain the matrix and the criteria for Key			
Intersection selection.			
Create a view of the common categories of effort, with Lead and			
Contributing organizations, for each selected Key Intersection.			
Update contact information for any new stakeholders and			
mission partners. This stage may require identification and			
participation of additional subject matter experts within			
stakeholder organizations based on the operating environment			
of the Key Intersection (Example: CCMDs may need to request a			
JTF representative participate in the Deep Dive to fully explain			
capabilities, capacities, and activities for the Key Intersection).			
Explain Framework terms Capability, Capacity, and Activity.			
Explain the need for common measures of progress.			
To begin the Deep Dive, conduct a teleconference or online			
meeting to explain the information request.			
Send a request with instructions for stakeholders and mission			
partners to fill in the Deep Dive information worksheets. Give			
them at least four weeks to complete.			
Give stakeholders and mission partners enough time to gather			
and submit the data (approximately four weeks on average).			
Review stakeholder input and follow up if there is missing or			
incomplete information.			

Table 4. Stage 4 Checklist (Optional Follow-On Stage)

Continued→

Table 4. Stage 4 Checklist (Optional Follow-On Stage) (continued)

Task	YES	NO	Comments or Remarks
Using the stakeholder provided information, merge the data into			
a combined worksheet for each Key Intersection.			
Request that stakeholders and mission partners present their			
input to each other in a meeting to improve common			
understanding and in preparation for the Deep Dive analysis.			
Conduct a face-to-face meeting for Deep Dive analysis of Key			
Intersections and develop recommendations/opportunities to			
synchronize planning.			
Stakeholders and mission partners compare and contrast			
capabilities, capacities, and activities.			
Stakeholders and mission partners agree upon and document			
common measures of progress.			
Stakeholders and mission partners consider budget cycles and			
planning timelines in their review of the consolidated			
capabilities, capacities, and activities.			
Document recommendations resulting from Deep Dive analysis.			
Capture any new mission specific terms and definitions.			
Post all stage 4 information on a collaborative worksite			
(intranet) that all stakeholders and mission partners can access.			
Agree on a timeline with all stakeholders and mission partners			
to conduct a reassessment and update of the Framework.			
Brief results and recommendations to senior leaders.			

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

Unity of effort requires an understanding of each organization's unique contributions. As the Framework is applied, partnerships and relationships are formed that need to be nurtured and formalized over time. Stakeholders and mission partners begin to see how they and others can plan and operate together toward common objectives. The Framework's biggest contribution to unity of effort is bringing people together and forming lasting professional relationships.

The need for continuous collaboration, information collection, analysis, and measures of progress requires a great deal of time. Time management is a required skill in any interagency effort as it helps in accomplishing specific interagency tasks, goals, and complying with deadlines. It is aided by facilitator skills, tools, techniques, and methods (allocation, setting goals, delegation, analysis of time use, monitoring, organizing, scheduling, and prioritizing). Effective management of time, personnel, and resources will enable the coordination or facilitation group to think creatively and work effectively.

The Framework is provided as an aid to support existing planning processes such as the Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and Federal Planning Process (FPP). The methodology explained in this Solution Guide, when applied, helps interagency planners and programmers overcome or mitigate some of the basic inhibitors to achieving unity of effort that have been documented in numerous lessons learned, articles, and publications.

Inhibitors to Achieving Unity of Effort

(Based on a survey of planners at USNORTHCOM and USSOUTHCOM)

- Stove pipes/silos (lack of information sharing)
- No visibility of efforts and activities across USG agencies
- Partner nations confused over mixed messages from different USG agencies and departments
- Lack of planning resources in civilian agencies
- Differing lexicon/taxonomy/language across USG agencies
- Disparate activities
- No established process for interagency planning (ad hoc)

ADMINISTRATIVE/OPERATIONAL USE ONLY

- No global repository of information
- No forcing function to drive unity of effort for a given mission
- Conflicts in planning timelines across USG agencies
- Random acts of goodness (uncoordinated) by non-governmental organizations
- Competing priorities across USG agencies

Use of the Framework shows improvement in most of these areas, including improved information sharing, visibility of efforts, identifying disparate activities, consistent Framework process, identifying conflicts in planning timelines, and highlighting areas of competing priorities. It does not mitigate or completely solve a lack of planning resources, the need for a global information repository, differing language taxonomies across interagency organizations, nor does it provide a forcing function for unity of effort. These areas remain as challenges for improving interagency unity of effort. The Framework is but one step in the right direction. Improvements to unity of effort should continue to evolve through practice and application.

APPENDIX A. JKO COURSE INFORMATION

JKO Internet Public Site:

https://jkolmsip.jten.mil

Unity of Effort Framework J3OP-US1214

Course (3 hrs). The purpose of this course is to introduce the Unity of Effort Framework. This Framework introduction includes how a Joint Force must partner with U.S. Government departments and agencies to achieve strategic goals and missions. This course provides detailed instruction on the concept of the Framework, the Framework's four stages, and



elements of a successful Framework. This course also identifies the process of improving for unity of effort with interagency partners utilizing the Framework's definitions, templates, and instructions as well as the inherent challenges stemming from planning complex interagency missions.

First-time JKO Student with a Common Access Card (CAC). Go to <u>https://jkolmsip.jten.mil</u> and click "OK" on the DOD Warning Banner. Under Login Options, click "Login with CAC (Internet Explorer only)" and select your current CAC certificate in the "Select Certificate" pop up box and click "OK." Non-CAC users follow instructions provided on the login page to submit an account request to the JKO Help Desk.

First-time students are automatically directed to the "My Profile" page to establish a JKO account profile. Complete all required fields (marked by *) on the "My Profile" page, noting specific guidance below regarding your user name, organization and email.

JKO Student without a CAC. Click on the link "No-DoD CAC." This link will open an email to the JKO Help Desk that asks for the student's information. Fill out the information and submit. An account will be set up for the student and an email confirmation sent. This link enables anyone with a .com address, including multinational partners, to set up an account and take the Unity of Effort Framework JKO course.

If a student has a .com email, they will need to have a .gov/.mil sponsor to register on JKO Direct.

Take the Unity of Effort Framework Course. Click on the "Course Catalog" tab and enter the course number "J3OP-US1214" in the first box. Click on the "Search" button. In the search results menu, click on the "Enroll" button. Go to your "My Training" tab and then click on the "Launch" button to begin taking the course. Follow the instructions for completing the course.

APPENDIX B. GLOSSARY OF TERMS

3D Planning Guide: A reference tool designed to help planners understand the purpose of each agency's plans, the processes that generate them, and, most importantly, to help identify opportunities for coordination among the three. Diplomacy, Development, and Defense (3Ds) – as represented by the Department of State (DOS), the USAID, and the DOD – are the three pillars that provide the foundation for promoting and protecting U.S. national security interests abroad.

Activities: For the Framework activities refers to how capabilities are accomplished in a Key Intersection.

Authority: USG agencies and organizations draw their authority from the U.S. Code, Presidential directives and executive orders, decisions of the Federal courts and treaties. (gpo.gov) Power to influence thought, opinion or behavior – implies the power of winning devotion or allegiance or of compelling acceptance and belief – the right or power to command, rule or judge.

Capability: For the Framework capability refers to the "what and why" that is taking place in a Key Intersection.

Capacity: For the Framework capacity refers to the "where and when/how often" a capability is exercised in a Key Intersection.

Categories of Effort: For the Framework Categories of Effort can be elements of national power or lines of effort. The type of exertion expended for a specified purpose. See Elements of National Power.

Common Objective: An objective agreed upon by all stakeholders.

Coordinate Objective: A statement of the condition or state one expects to achieve. (*USAID Glossary of Evaluation Terms* and DOD). The clearly defined, decisive and attainable goal toward which every operation is directed. Objectives are developed within the context of existing U.S. national security and foreign policies, and are derived from higher-level guidance.

Contributing: For the Framework, refers to a Stakeholder or mission partner that is executing, supporting, sharing or involved at some level in an intersection in support of the lead organization.

Deep Dive: Stakeholders and mission partners will collectively conduct an examination with a primary focus on capabilities ("what and why"), capacity ("where, when and how often"), and activities ("how capabilities are being accomplished") at a specific Key Intersection of common objective and operating environment.

Development: The provision of aid and other assistance to regions that are less economically developed. The provision of assistance to developing countries. Sustained, concerted effort of policymakers and

communities to promote a standard of living and economic health in a specific area. (DOS)

Diplomatic Actions: (DOD) Those international public information activities of the United States Government designed to promote United States foreign policy objectives by seeking to understand, inform and influence foreign audiences and opinion makers, and by broadening the dialogue between American citizens and institutions and their counterparts abroad (*JP 1-02-see Public Diplomacy*). The diplomatic instrument of national power is the principal instrument for engaging with other states and foreign groups to advance U.S. values, interests, and objectives.

Drill Down: For the Framework project, to look at or examine something in-depth.

Economic (Elements of National Power): Government agencies only partially control the economic instrument of national power. In keeping with U.S. values and constitutional imperatives, individuals and entities have broad freedom of action worldwide. The responsibility of the USG lies with facilitating the production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services worldwide that promote U.S. fundamental objectives, such as promoting general welfare and supporting security interests and objectives.

Elements of National Power: The ways through which the interagency community is able to leverage the political, economic and military strengths of the USG in order to influence other states and non-state actors. The United States can make use of these elements directly, through the various agencies that make up the federal government, or indirectly, by mobilizing the population, industry and businesses of the country. (Derived from the *National Security Strategy*, 2010)

End State: Long-term strategic goals that are of an enduring nature. Organizations pursue these end states as they develop over-arching theater or functional strategies, which they translate into an integrated set of steady-state activities by means of campaign plans. (derived from *3D Planning Guide*)

Facilitator: One who helps to bring about an outcome (learning, productivity or communication) by providing indirect or unobtrusive assistance, guidance, or supervision (Merriam-Webster). An organization or individual that leads the debate and ultimate reconciliation of each agency's characterization of the elements of the three-dimensional view (Framework).

Financial (Elements of National Power): The financial instrument of national power promotes the conditions for prosperity and stability in the United States and encourages prosperity in the rest of the world. The Department of Treasury is the primary federal agency responsible for the economic and financial prosperity and security of the U.S. and as such is responsible for a wide range of activities, including advising the President on economic and financial issues, promoting the President's growth agenda, and enhancing corporate governance in financial institutions. In the international arena, the Treasury works with other federal agencies, the governments of other nations, and the international financial institutions to encourage economic growth; raise standards of living; and predict and prevent, to the extent possible, economic and financial crisis.

Foreign Disaster Relief: Prompt aid that can be used to alleviate the suffering of foreign disaster victims. Normally, it includes humanitarian services and transportation; the provision of food, clothing, medicine, beds and bedding; temporary shelter and housing; medical and technical materiel and personnel; repairs to essential services. (*JP 1-02*)

Assistance in response to a foreign disaster, which is an act of nature (such as a flood, drought, wildfire, hurricane, earthquake, volcanic eruption, or epidemic) or an act of man (such as a riot, violence, civil strife, explosion-fire) that is or threatens to be of sufficient severity and magnitude, the United States may provide emergency relief assistance as a humanitarian service consistent with U.S foreign policy goals. Assistance shall to the greatest extent possible reach those most in need of relief and rehabilitation. U.S. assistance supports and encourages host country participation in disaster preparedness activities and supplements rather than replaces host country disaster relief resources. (compiled from *DOS 2 FAM 061* and *061.1*)

Foreign Military Sales (FMS): That portion of U.S. security assistance authorized by the Arms Export Control Act of 1976, and conducted based on formal contracts or agreements between the United States Government and an authorized recipient government or international organization. FMS includes government-to-government sales of defense articles or defense services, from DOD stocks or through new procurements under DOD-managed contracts, regardless of the source of financing. Though specifically designed to support the provision of Security Assistance, the FMS process can be employed to procure defense articles, training and services using a variety of sources of funding, not just Title 22 funding. (*JP 1-02*)

Framework: For the Unity of Effort Framework project, a Framework is a mechanism that allows government agencies to visualize and preempt or resolve potential conflicts in their actions, activities and resources in order to support a specific national strategy or policy (e.g., *Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime*, a Humanitarian Assistance/ Disaster Relief Operation, or other operations).

Gap: A capability gap is an inability to perform a task because of a lack of equipment, training, doctrine, authority or support. (Defense Acquisition University [DAU]) A gap can be thought of as the difference between needs and resources. They exist where no agencies have the capacity or authority to meet a requirement.

Governance: Consistent management, cohesive policies, guidance, processes and decision-rights for a given area of responsibility. The physical exercise of management power and policy.

Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief: Assistance rendered to a country or population in an emergency or crisis context. This could include natural or manmade disaster response or complex humanitarian emergency. (USAID) (*3D Planning Guide*) Programs conducted to relieve or reduce the results of natural or manmade disasters or other endemic

conditions such as human pain, disease, hunger, or privation that might present a serious threat to life or that can result in great damage to or loss of property. Humanitarian assistance provided by U.S. forces is limited in scope and duration. The assistance provided is designed to supplement or complement the efforts of the host nation civil authorities or agencies that may have the primary responsibility for providing humanitarian assistance. (*JP 1-02*)

Information (Elements of National Power): The informational instrument of national power has a diffuse and complex set of components with no single center of control. In the United States, individuals exchange information freely with minimal government control. Information itself is a strategic resource vital to national security. This reality applies to all instruments, entities, and activities of national power and extends to the armed forces at all levels.

Intelligence (Elements of National Power): Intelligence, as an instrument of national power, provides the national leadership with the information needed to realize national goals and objectives while providing military leadership with the information needed to accomplish missions and implement the national security strategy.

Interagency (IA): Made up of, involving, or representing two or more U.S. government agencies; interagency cooperation, partners, or organizations. (Dictionary.com)

Interagency Policy Committee (IPC): An appointed committee that is responsible for designated national security issues that cut across the responsibilities of Executive Branch departments and agencies. Issues may be regional, such as U.S. policy toward Iraq or North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) expansion, or functional, such as arms control agreements with Russia or terrorism in South Asia (*National Security Policy Process: The National Security Council and Interagency System*).

Intersection: A matrix or spreadsheet cell that crosses an objective with an operating environment.

Key Intersections: For the Framework a Key Intersection is a matrix cell (intersection of column and row) that represents an activity for which the whole of government focuses a significant amount of planning resources. A cell that needs the most unity of effort, accounting for all of the capabilities and resources that are planned to contribute to the activities represented in that cell.

Law Enforcement (Elements of National Power): Through the law enforcement instrument of national power, the USG is accountable to its people and can govern its territory effectively. The USG has the capability and capacity to: Enforce the law and defend the interests of the United States according to law; Ensure public safety against threats foreign and domestic; Provide federal leadership in preventing and controlling crime; Seek just punishment for those guilty of unlawful behavior; Ensure fair and impartial administration of justice for all Americans.

Lead: For the Framework lead indicates that the organization has primary responsibility to coordinate

and integrate USG effort involving all U.S. departments and agencies with relevant capabilities to prepare, plan for and conduct operations in an intersection of an objective and environment within the matrix of the Unity of Effort Framework. Lead may be determined by law (Title 50, Title 10), by directive (Executive Agent or Lead Federal Agency designation), or by precedent in terms of established mission roles, responsibilities, and authorities. There can be multiple leads identified in the Framework.

Matrix: For the Framework the matrix is a spreadsheet view of the three elements: Common Objectives, Operating Environments, and Categories of Effort. It is the starting point where Stakeholders and Mission Partners begin collaboration and coordination of efforts.

Matrix or Spreadsheet Cell: For the Framework a column and row intersection within a Framework matrix to be populated by stakeholder organizations. This represents the intersection of a common objective and a specific operating area for a given mission.

Major Contribution: For the Framework a major contribution is an organization's priority of effort for the issue objective and operating environments.

Military (Elements of National Power): In wielding the military instrument of national power, the armed forces must ensure their adherence to U.S. values, constitutional principles, and standards for the profession of arms. While responsibility for wielding the other instruments of power rests outside the military establishment, U.S. military leaders are responsible for providing the advice and recommendation necessary for the overall U.S. effort to properly incorporate the military instrument with the other instruments of national power. Unified action within the military instrument supports the national strategic unity of effort through close coordination with the other instruments of national power.

National Security Staff (NSS): An interdepartmental body to advise the President with respect to the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policies relating to national security.

Operating Environment: A combination of conditions, surroundings, circumstances, and landscape: The Operating Environment can be looked at in many ways, some examples are; geographic regions, sectors, domains, critical terrain, countries, states, key border crossings between nations, mountainous areas, and land routes which are forms of identifying locations or areas where activities take place and bear on the decisions of leaders. Others may be more specific with identifying the operating environment for example; sub-regions, portfolios, seaports, bridges, roadways, waterways, airfields, air corridors.

Planning: The process to identify appropriate results, develop approaches to reach them, assign needed resources, organize to achieve results, and identify the means to measure progress (*3D Planning Guide*, DOD). An orderly, analytical process that consists of a logical set of steps to analyze a mission, select the best course of action, and produce an operation plan or order. (Derived from *JP 5-0*)
Priority: For the Framework project, the primary goal or goals in an endeavor. In interagency operations, each agency will have its own, sometimes competing, priorities. If not synchronized, these priorities must be aligned and de-conflicted during the planning process.

Resources: The personnel, materiel, and other assets or capabilities apportioned or allocated to the commander of a unified or specified command (Derived from *JP 1-02*). Available resources are a major factor in determining an organization's capacity.

Seams: The divisions between different organizations attempting to collaborate. Seams develop from the cultural and practical differences between organizations and decrease the interagency community's ability to develop complementary policies and plans, and to function as a cohesive community. (*3D Planning Guide*)

Shortfall: The lack of forces, equipment, personnel, materiel or capability, reflected as the difference between the resources identified as a plan requirement and those apportioned to a combatant commander for planning that would adversely affect the command's ability to accomplish its mission. (*JP 5-0*) The difference between the resources that are needed and those that are available.

Stakeholder: A person or group that has an investment, share, or interest in something, as an organization, business or industry. Organizations that play an important part in the design and outcome of a stated issue. (Dictionary.com and adapted from the *Theater Campaign Handbook*)

Sufficiency: The adequacy of quantity, quality, frequency and duration.

Synchronize (Synchronization): The act of arranging actions in time, space and purpose to produce maximum effectiveness at a decisive place and time. Synchronization allows for a more efficient use of resources by minimizing the appearance and impact of redundancy. (Derived from *JP 2-0*)

Theater Campaign Plans (TCP): 1. Joint operation plan for a series of related major operations aimed at achieving strategic or operational objectives within specific theater during a specific time (*JP 5-0*). 2. TCPs link military engagement and security cooperation activities to current operations and contingency plans as well as broader foreign policy goals (*3D Planning Guide*).

Threat: A potential negative event that can cause a risk to become a loss, expressed as an aggregate of risk, consequences of risk, and the likelihood of the occurrence of such an event. A threat may be the result of both natural phenomena and intentional or unintentional human intervention. (Derived from the *Business Dictionary*)

United States Code (USC): The codification by subject matter of the general and permanent laws of the United States based on what is printed in the Statutes at Large. It is divided by broad subjects into 50 titles and published by the Office of the Law Revision Counsel of the U.S. House of Representatives.

These titles describe the legal capabilities and limitations of the various agencies within all three branches of the USG.

Unity of Effort: Coordination and cooperation toward common objectives, even if the participants are not necessarily part of the same command or organization. The product of successful unified action. (*JP-1*)

(DOS) A cooperative concept, which refers to coordination and communication among USG organizations toward the same common goals for success; in order to achieve unity of effort. It is not necessary for all organizations to be controlled under the same command structure, but it is necessary for each agency's efforts to be in harmony with the short- and long-term goals of the mission. Unity of effort is based on four principles:

- Common understanding of the situation
- Common vision or goals for the R&S mission
- Coordination of efforts to ensure continued coherency
- Common measures of progress and ability to change course if necessary

Unity of Effort Framework: A multipurpose planning aid designed to improve unity of effort by setting the stage for Stakeholder's coordination, synchronization, visibility and information sharing.

APPENDIX C. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

3D	Defense, Diplomacy, Development
CAC	Common Access Card
OLCO	Capstone Concept for Joint Operations: Joint Force 2020 (2012)
CCMD	Combatant Command
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
C-TOC	Combating Transnational Organized Crime
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
DIMEFIL	Diplomatic, Information, Military, Economic, Financial, Intelligence, and
	Law Enforcement
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOS	Department of State
FDR	Foreign Disaster Relief
FMS	Foreign Military Sales
FPP	Federal Planning Process
HA/DR	Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief
ICE	Immigration and Customs Enforcement
IPC	Interagency Policy Committee
JCS	Joint Chiefs of Staff
JKO	Joint Knowledge Online
JP	Joint Publication
JSAP	Joint Staff Action Package
JTF	Joint Task Force
MDMP	Military Decision Making Process
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGB	National Guard Bureau
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NSS	National Security Strategy
ТСР	Theater Campaign Plan
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development

USC	U.S. Code
USG	U.S. Government
USNORTHCOM	U.S. Northern Command
USSOCOM	U.S. Special Operations Command
USSOUTHCOM	U.S. Southern Command

WHEM Western Hemisphere

APPENDIX D. REFERENCES

Capstone Concept for Joint Operations (CCJO): Joint Force 2020, September 2012

Charter of the Diplomacy, Development, and Defense (3D) Planning Group, September 2011

Code of Federal Regulations (CFR)

Department of Defense Guidance for the Employment of the Force (GEF), April 2011

Foreign Disaster Emergency Manual 060, 061, 061.1, 2012 (Department of State)

Joint Publication 1-0, Joint Personnel Support. 24 October 2011

Joint Publication 1-02, Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms, 8 November 2010 (As Amended Through 15 November 2012)

Joint Publication 2-0, Joint Intelligence, 22 June 2007

Joint Publication 5-0, Joint Operation Planning, 11 August 2011

Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE): A Metrics Framework, 2010 (U.S. Institute for Peace)

National Security Policy Process: The National Security Council and Interagency System, August 2011

National Security Strategy (NSS), May 2010

Strategy to Combat Transnational Organized Crime, July 2011

Theater Campaign Planning Planner's Handbook, February 2012

United States Code (USC)

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Glossary of Terms

APPENDIX E. FACILITATION/COORDINATION GROUP DETAILED TEMPLATE INSTRUCTIONS

These instructions on how to build a Framework matrix are designed for the facilitation or coordination group. It will walk the group through a step-by-step process to build a Framework matrix to be used by stakeholders and mission partners addressing an interagency issue.

Following these directions, the facilitation group is responsible for the initial identification of stakeholders and mission partners, and will facilitate stakeholder identification of common objectives, common operating environments, and common categories of effort. Once identified, all elements need to be inserted into the matrix. The format for the initial blank matrix is provided but will require manipulation from a member of facilitation/coordination group.

Locate the "Blank Matrix" (see figure 26) tab after you open the file. You will see areas already established for the stakeholders and mission partners, identified objectives, and operating environments. The top left area of the matrix is the stakeholders and mission partners area of the spreadsheet. Directly below the stakeholders and mission partners area is the operating environment ranking area. Below the operating environment area is the objectives area of the spreadsheet. To the right of the stakeholders and mission partners area is the objective ranking area. To the right of the objective ranking area, running across the top of the spreadsheet, is the operating environments area. The categories of effort area for the matrix is at the intersection of the objectives and the operating environments called the "matrix cells." Each cell has a dropdown menu for the identification of the categories of efforts for each stakeholder.

Add Objectives to the Matrix

To insert the stakeholder identified objectives in the matrix, move the cursor to the objective area on the left side of the matrix and click on the objective 1 box. Type the information for objective 1 in the objective 1 box the way you would like it to appear in the matrix. Once completed, move the cursor to the objective 2 box, click on the box and type the information for objective 2 the way you would like it to appear in the matrix. Continue this process for all objectives identified by stakeholders and mission partners.



Figure 26. Blank Matrix

Add Operating Environments to the Matrix

To insert the stakeholder identified operating environments in the matrix, move the cursor to the operating environment area across the top of the matrix and click on the operating environment 1 box. Type the information for operating environment 1 in the operating environment 1 box the way you would like it to appear in the matrix. Once accomplished, move the cursor to the operating environment 2 box, click on the box and type the information for operating environment 2 the way you would like it to appear in the matrix. Continue this process for all operating environments identified by the stakeholders and mission partners.

Use Dropdown Menus to Add Stakeholders and Mission Partners, Categories of Effort, and Priorities in the Matrix

Note: The use of dropdown menus is a Microsoft Excel function. To turn on, off, or modify dropdown fields, use the Data \rightarrow Validate menu.

Dropdown menus are used in four areas of the matrix to insert information: the stakeholder area, the objective ranking area, the operating environment ranking area, and the categories of effort area for the objective/operating area intersections. Dropdown menus in these areas are identified when you place the mouse cursor on the cell and click the mouse. A small down arrow will appear in the lower right-hand corner of the cell. Click on the down arrow to display the dropdown menu. Once the menu appears, move the cursor over the word from the list that applies and select it. The word will appear in the matrix cell. If multiple words from the dropdown menu apply, repeat the process.

To allow the dropdown menu process to take place, the list for each dropdown menu has to be created by populating the list. The format for each dropdown menu is created by the facilitation group. A generic format for the stakeholder, priority and category of effort dropdown menu/list is already established in the matrix below the objective area. To modify any of the dropdown menu lists, place the cursor over the list you want to modify and click the box. For example, to modify the stakeholder dropdown menu in the stakeholder area of the matrix, move the cursor to the stakeholder list below the objective area. Click on the stakeholder 1 box and type the information for stakeholder 1 the way you would like it to appear in the matrix. Once completed, move the cursor to the stakeholder 2 box, click on the box and type the information for stakeholder 2 the way you would like it to appear in the matrix. Continue this process for the entire stakeholder list, writing each the way you would like them to appear in the dropdown menu. Use the same process to add or delete the numbers in the priority dropdown menu, also depicted in the figure below, as required.

After stakeholders and mission partners, objectives, operating environments, categories of effort, and priorities are filled in for the matrix, the facilitation/coordination group can distribute it to stakeholders and mission partners for their completion of stage 3 of the Framework.

ENCLOSURE 1

UNITED STATES SOUTHERN COMMAND (USSOUTHCOM) Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Relief (HA/DR) Unity of Effort Framework (Example)



Notes:

- For the purpose of this example the Unity of Effort Framework is focused on planning for Foreign Disaster Relief (FDR) *preparedness* in a natural, rapid onset, disaster mission scenario.
- Representatives from the following agencies assigned to the USSOUTHCOM staff participated in the development of this example: Department of State, US Agency for International Development (USAID) (Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance), Department of Commerce and DOD.
- 3. This is an example for the purposes of demonstrating the use of the Unity of Effort Framework and does not represent any official policy or priorities of the U.S. Government.

HA/DR Example: USG Preparedness for Foreign Disaster Relief

Introduction: The Unity of Effort Framework is a planning aid designed to improve unity of effort and facilitate U.S. Government stakeholder and mission partner coordination, synchronization, visibility and information sharing. The basis for unity of effort is the following four principles:

- Common vision, goals and objectives for the mission
- Common understanding of the situation
- Coordination of efforts to ensure continued coherency
- Common measures of progress and ability to change course as needed

Purpose: In developing the Framework, the Building Partnership – Unity of Effort Framework Project Experiment Support Agreement (ESA) signed by USSOUTHCOM, USNORTHCOM, and Joint Staff J7 on 10 May 2012 specified that a HA/DR example, based on the best practices of USSOUTHCOM, be developed as an annex to the Unity of Effort Framework. The purpose of the example includes how the Framework could be used:

- A methodology to develop and evaluate detailed aspects of HA/DR strategic objectives to include interagency capabilities, capacities, and authorities necessary to accomplish those objectives.
- A process to understand redundancies and shortfalls in order to de-conflict and synchronize agency plans and programs within the HA/DR mission space.

Assumption:

- HA/DR missions are crisis unique and only relevant USG agencies are called upon for an HA/DR response.
- All major USG agencies conduct preparedness activities in order to support response activities when requested.
- USAID/OFDA and DOS support all USG HA/DR missions.

Constraints and Limitations:

- USG HA/DR efforts in disparate theater, regional, and tactical level plans are not always synchronized. In addition, each organization's activities are not always understood or integrated across the USG.
- Interagency organizations translate national strategic document into plans according to their own processes (different planning horizons, etc.)

• The fast pace of crisis action planning does not always allow for consensus building.

Stage 1: Issue and Stakeholder Identification are driven by a specific national strategy or set of policies. Stakeholders and mission partners include agencies of the national government that engage in HA/DR activities. Following is a list of references that were consulted to identify an inclusive set of USG stakeholders and mission partners involved in HA/DR activities.

HA/DR REFERENCES:

- FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT 1961
- TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, SECTIONS 402, 2557, AND 2561
- 2005 US FOREIGN ASSISTNACE REFERENCE GUIDE
- NSPD 44
- 2010 NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY
- 2011 NATIONAL MILITARY STRATEGY
- 2010 QUADRENNIAL DEFENSE REVIEW
- 2010 QUADRENNIAL DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW
- 2010-2012 GUIDANCE FOR EMPLOYMENT OF THE FORCE
- 2012 DOD DIRECTIVE 5100.46, "FOREIGN DISASTER RELIEF"
- DOD 5105.38-M, "SECURITY ASSISTANCE MANAGEMENT MANUAL" (SAMM), CHAPTER 12

HA/DR STAKEHOLDERS AND MISSION PARTNERS:

- US Agency for International Development (USAID)
- Department of State (DOS)
- Department of Defense (DOD)
- Department of Commerce (DOC)
- Department of Agriculture (USDA)
- Health & Human Services (HHS)
- Department of Energy (DOE)
- Department of the Interior (USGS)
- Department of the Treasury (DOT)
- Department of Homeland Security (DHS)

Stage 2: Build a Common View. Using stage 1 information and documentation, determine the common USG objectives, categories of effort, and geographic regions.

- 1) Objectives: The HA/DR mission set has no national level strategy dictating a whole of government approach to HA/DR. The USG Foreign Assistance Act and Title 10 of the US Code provide authority to conduct HA/DR activities. Specific USG agencies have provided agency specific policy guidance to their organizations for their unique HA/DR roles and responsibilities. Based on a review of the references listed above and in consultation with SOUTHCOM Stakeholders and Mission Partners the following three objectives were identified for a whole of government approach to HA/DR preparedness operations:
 - <u>Objective 1</u> Enhance internal partner capacity for disaster risk reduction, mitigation and preparedness
 - <u>Objective 2</u> Build regional capacity for disaster risk reduction, mitigation and preparedness
 - <u>Objective 3</u> Maintain US capacity to provide Foreign Disaster Relief in the three regions

The stakeholders and mission partners reached these objectives after scoping the framework to a preparedness mission set during steady-state. OFDA calls this "Disaster Risk Reduction."

- 2) Regions: The regions in this example were broken into three large groupings: Central America, the Caribbean Basin and South America. Each of these regions has a regional disaster response center. The three regional centers are:
 - <u>CEPREDENAC</u> in Central America-headquarters in Guatemala
 - <u>CDEMA</u> in the Caribbean Basin-headquarters in Antigua
 - <u>CAPRADE</u> in South America- for the Andean Region-located in Peru

In order to provide a country level look as well as a regional look the countries of Central America are listed individually. Central America is a key region for SOUTHCOM because it has a preponderance of the disasters and the countries in the region generally request assistance. Additionally, the USG is supporting efforts to improve the response capacity of CDEMA.



- **3) Categories of Effort:** The categories of effort were drawn from a compilation of OFDA's human sectors, DOD's lines of effort and DOS's organizing principles. All parties agreed that they could map their efforts to these broad categories of effort.
 - a. Political: political and diplomatic coordination is required for all activities related to foreign disaster response preparedness
 - b. Economic: includes all aspects of building robust economic systems capable of withstanding disasters
 - c. Security-Civil and Military Activities: necessary to secure personnel, relief material and economic systems
 - d. Logistics/Transportation: supply and movement of relief commodities and personnel
 - e. Health/Medical/Nutrition: all activities associated with emergency life saving measures and longer term disease control and prevention and malnutrition
 - f. Infrastructures/Engineering: includes recovery and reconstruction of shelters and water and sanitation systems
 - g. Information-all activities associated with command and control, communications and information management
 - h. Food Security/Agriculture-includes immediate and longer term food requirements

The figure below portrays a three-dimensional view of the common objectives, operating environment, and categories of effort. The next stage will address the intersections of these three elements to

determine lead and contributing roles and key intersections for deeper and more detailed information sharing and planning.



Stage 3: Build a Common Understanding. In stage 3, the three elements identified in stages 1 and 2 are entered onto an excel spreadsheet. The left hand column lists the objectives and the top row lists the regions. This creates cells that are populated by stakeholders and mission partners. The stakeholders and mission partners looked at each cell and determined if they were pursuing any activities at that intersection along each of the categories of effort. Additionally, they indicated whether they thought they were a lead agency or a contributing agency along each of the categories of effort. The stakeholders and mission partners based on the priority that their agency placed on that objective or region. However, the participants generally thought that any ranking that they provided would be highly speculative so we did not use this as a criterion for determining key intersections.

Once all agencies submitted their data, it was aggregated to create a comprehensive view. This view helps highlight areas of significant USG activities and is highlighted in yellow. Next the stakeholders and mission partners developed criteria for selecting Key Intersections. Key Intersections are intersections

where a large amount of USG activity is occurring and where stakeholders and mission partners think that further information sharing and planning in stage 4 analyses would be useful. The criteria used for identifying key intersections for HA/DR preparedness included:

- A country's capacity to respond
- A country's willingness to accept help
- The likelihood of a disaster occurring in a given country

Collective FDR Matrix											
USG Preparedness for Foreign Disaster Relief		Casta Rica	Hond	Palia.	wicar,	enga.	Guatemasi	REDENAC Bell.	South Merica Calification	Carilyan Carilyan CDEINA	Remarks in Free Text
Operating Environment Ranking											
Objective 1 – Enhance internal	sc	C-L&T C-H; C-I&E C-I; C- M&C				C-L&T C-H; C- I&E C-I; C-M&C		18E; C-1; C-M&C	C-L&T C-H; C-I&E C-I; C-M&C	Haiti, Dom Rep C187; C-H; C-I&E C-I; C-M&C	
partner capacity for disaster risk reduction, mitigation and	00C #2	C-E,C-P, C-LT, C-IE, C-FS, C- MC		C-E,C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	C-E,C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC		C-E,C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	C-E, C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	C-E,C-P, C-LT, C-IE, C-FS, C-MC	Haiti, Dom Roo C-E,C-P, C-LT, C-FS, C-MC	Work with individual partners, as appropriate, to enhance capacities
preparedness	005	L-P/C-E/C-S/C-L&T/C H/C-I&E/L-I/C-FS/C- M&C	LP	L-P	LP	L-P	LP	L-P	L-P	Heiti, Dom Rép L-	State Dept has the lead on foreign policy in all countries, for American Citizen Services, and for public affairs. Its programs contribute to economic growth.
	sc								(BOL, EPO, PER, COL) L-MAC; C-P; C-L&T C-I		For South America (CHI, BRA, COL, PER) block
Objective 2 - Build regional capacity for disaster risk reduction, mitigation and preparedness	00C #3	C-E C-P, G-LT, C-IE, G-FS, C- MC	C-E C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	C-E C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC		1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	C-E C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	C-E C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	(941, BRA, PER, COL) CC-E C-P, C-LT, C-IE, C-FS, C-MC	C E C P, C-LT, C I E, C-IS, C-MC	Work with regional partners, as appropriate, to enhance capacities, There are three regional centers: ODEMA (Antigua), CAPRADE (Andean Region-Peru), CEPREDENAC (Guatamala)
preparedness	005 #3	L-P	L-P	L-P	L₽	L-P	LP	ĿP	(OHI, BRA, PER, COL) L-P	L-P	State Dept has the lead on foreign policy in all countries, for American Gitizen Services, and for public relations.
	SC		\frown							Haiti, Dom Rep	N/A - Blue Force Objective
Objective 3 – Maintain US capacity to provide Foreign Disaster Relief in each of the	00C #1	GE,GP, GLT, GIE, GFS, G MC		C-E,C-P, C-LT, C- E, C-FS, C-MC	C-E,C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC		C-E,C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, G-MC	C-E, C-P, C-LT, C- IE, C-FS, C-MC	C-E,C-P, C-LT, C-IE, C-FS, C-MC		ryn - auer rolec vojecine DOC is primary POC whit US Private Sector/Business; private secor has potential to play a role in preparation for disaster risk reduction; private sector priority is safety of their people also assiance to victims, safety of property.
regions	005 #1	L-P	ĿP	ψp	L₽	L-P	LP	ĿP	L-P	Hviti, Dom Rep L-P	State Dept has the lead on foreign policy in all countries, for American Citizen Services, and for public relations.

Lines of Effort	Abbreviation
Lead-Politicial	L-P
Contributing-Political	C-P
Economic	L-E
Contributing-Economic	C-E
Lead-Security	L-S
Contributing-Security	C-S
Lead-Logistic/Transportation	L-L&T
Contributing-Logistic/Transportation	C-L&T
Lead-Health/Medical/Nutrition	L-H
Contributing-Health/Mecical/Nutrition	C-H
Lead-Infastructure/Engineering	L-1&E
Contributing-Infastructure/Engineering	C-1&E
Lead-Information	L-I
Contributing-Information	C-1
Lead-Food Security/Agriculture	L-FS
Contributing-Food Security/Agriculture	C-FS
Lead-Management and Coordination	L-M&C
Contributing-Management and Coordination	C-M&C

Organizations	Abbreviation
US AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL	
DEVELOPMENT	AID
DEPARTMENT OF STATE	DOS
DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE	DOD
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE	DOC
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE	USDA
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES	HHS
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY	DOE
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR	USGS
DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY	DOT
DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY	DHS