

THE INTERAGENCY SERVICE CLUB

(Almost) Free Interagency Training and Education

*Thomas P. Moore, Ph.D., COL (Ret.), US Army Reserve
Professor of Joint Military Operations
U.S. Naval War College Monterey Program
699 Dyer Road, Halligan Hall, Rm 253
Monterey, CA 93943-5159*

INTRODUCTION

You’ve seen them in every town you’ve ever visited – the sign on the outskirts of town telling the world that the town has a Rotary Club, a Kiwanis Club, a Lion’s Club, etc. These clubs have been in existence in some cases for more than 100 years and have proliferated around the world.^{1,2} Rotary International claims to have nearly 33,000 local clubs and 1.22 million members worldwide, while Lions International claims 1.36 million members and 46,000 clubs in 206 countries.^{3,4} Many of these clubs follow similar meeting formats and general purposes. It seems that they have a persistent and successful model for what they do.



The goals of these clubs involve service to the community. One of Rotary’s goals is “The advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional persons united in the ideal of service.”⁵ The mission of the Lion’s Club is, “To empower volunteers to serve their communities, meet humanitarian needs, encourage peace and promote international understanding through Lions clubs.”⁶

Besides the altruistic motivations a person may have for joining such a club, members also benefit from the professional and social networks they develop as a result of club membership. This latter benefit can be a significant motivation for joining such a club. In this article, we will explore how the highly successful concept of the service club might be used to help employees of government agencies, non-governmental organizations and international organizations further develop their personal interagency professional network and knowledge of other agencies.

THE INTERAGENCY CHALLENGE

Over the past several decades, the Department of Defense, the Department of State and other parts of Federal, state and even local governments have encountered significant difficulties working seamlessly together to plan for and respond to national security crises and to natural and manmade disasters. For example, when Operation Blind Logic, the post-conflict plan associated with Operation Just Cause (the U.S. invasion of Panama to depose Manuel Noriega), was developed at

US Southern Command, "...the planning... dealt only with those issues that the military could address unilaterally, without the coordination of (sic) the (other) government departments."⁷ And according to the 2008 Project on National Security Reform, "the ongoing operations in Afghanistan and Iraq have generated numerous studies, many of which conclude that the U.S. government is not able to get its various national security organizations to work together well enough."⁸

Former U.S. Secretaries of State James Baker and Lawrence Eagleburger, and former Chair, House Committee on Foreign Affairs Lee Hamilton also addressed this issue in their 2006 Iraq Study Group Report:

For the longer term, the United States government needs to improve how its constituent agencies—Defense, State, Agency for International Development, Treasury, Justice, the intelligence community, and others—respond to a complex stability operation like that represented by this decade's Iraq and Afghanistan wars and the previous decade's operations in the Balkans. They need to train for, and conduct, joint operations across agency boundaries, following the Goldwater-Nichols model that has proved so successful in the U.S. armed services.⁹

In addition to recent difficulties meeting the "interagency challenge," government agencies are encountering more and more circumstances in which they must do interagency collaboration, coordination, integration and networking well or risk dealing poorly with a particular government responsibility. According to Frederick M. Kaiser of the Congressional Research Service:

In sum, these collaborative efforts extend beyond national security or homeland security—albeit, the most visible issue areas—to other varied policies and programs. Among these are protecting the environment; conserving natural resources; preparing for and responding to natural disasters and pandemics; restructuring the domestic financial sector; determining the safety and effectiveness of medications; regulating various consumer goods; implementing medical and social welfare programs; and granting security clearances.¹⁰

Kaiser gives four reasons for the increased need for interagency collaboration that has been experienced by government agencies in recent years:

1. The public has demanded that responsibilities of some government agencies increase or change in certain areas (for example, dealing with terrorist organizations after 9/11 became a new responsibility of the Department of Defense, while the responsibility of law enforcement agencies regarding terrorism changed somewhat).
2. Simultaneously in certain areas there have been pressures on government agencies to reduce the size, scope and cost of their responsibilities (for example, the Environmental Protection Agency has felt these sorts of pressures in recent years).

3. There has been an increase in the scope, number, variety and complexity of programs that assign responsibilities across multiple government agencies (a program called Project Sea Hawk in Charleston, SC is an example of this).¹¹
4. Several significant recent crises have been seen to suffer from inadequate interagency collaboration and coordination (recent examples include Hurricane Katrina, the 9/11 terrorist attacks and much of the immediate post-conflict period in Iraq).¹²

Thus we see that the “interagency challenge” has been widely recognized. The “interagency challenge” has even been recognized beyond the bounds of governmental organizations.¹³ It is really an “interorganizational challenge” that involves not just the U.S. Federal government, state/provincial governments, local governments and informal government-like organizations, but also non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international organizations, coalition partners, allies and even government contractors.¹⁴ According to the Katrina Lessons Learned document published by the White House under President George W. Bush, Jr., “faith-based and non-governmental groups were not adequately integrated into the response effort.”¹⁵

Unfortunately, the “interorganizational challenge” has turned out to be very hard to solve. The mere fact that it keeps recurring and causing problems is certainly evidence of this.¹⁶ Furthermore, at the federal level, the structure of the Executive Branch itself provides a barrier to interagency collaboration.

For example, the concept of unity of command is a well accepted principle within the Department of Defense and among local law enforcement and fire protection agencies: when a crisis arises, having one person, with no other duties, fully responsible for and controlling all the organizations responding to that crisis ensures the highest likelihood of obtaining a successful outcome. However, the current structure of the Executive Branch of the federal government makes it extremely difficult to put military units under the command of a civilian employee or political appointee working for a department outside of the Department of Defense. Conversely, it’s similarly difficult to put a section of personnel from, for example, the Federal Emergency Management Agency under the command of an officer from the Department of Defense.

BASIC BARRIERS TO INTERAGENCY AND INTERORGANIZATIONAL COLLABORATION

The interagency and interorganizational challenge results from a number of causes. Here are a few:

- Collective unfamiliarity with each other’s capabilities and limitations.
- Differences in the use of technical language.¹⁷
- Lack of knowledge of organizational cultures in other agencies.
- Lack of personal relationships with personnel from other agencies.
- Significant differences in organizational resources and capabilities.

- Differences in authorized responsibilities and missions.
- Differences in funding and legal authorities to expend government funds and engage in various activities.

EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE AS A BARRIER BREAKER

According to a study by William J. Davis, Jr., "...education and experience may mitigate any predisposed tendency to be insular and think of "other communities" (interagency) as less able or less important."¹⁸ You can see that the first four items on the list above might be mitigated by education and experience. If this is so, then three questions arise:

1. How should this education and experience be made available?
2. Who should be exposed to this education and experience?
3. What is the appropriate content of this education and experience?

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR INTERAGENCY EDUCATION, TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE

The National Security Professional Development (NSPD) Program: In May, 2007, President George W. Bush issued Executive Order 13434, which established the National Security Professional Development (NSPD) program. Shortly thereafter, the *National Strategy for the Development of Security Professionals* was released by the White House. Both the Executive Order and the *National Strategy* included homeland security as part of its definition of national security. According to the *National Strategy*:

The national security professional will need access to education, training, and opportunities to work in coordination with other Federal departments and agencies, State, local, territorial and tribal governments, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, foreign governments, and international organizations...¹⁹

Thus one goal of the NSPD program is to, "improve interagency collaboration by cultivating a community of national security professionals (NSPs)."²⁰

In her recent analysis of the NSPD program, Catherine Dale concluded that, "While the initial intent of the NSPD program ... appeared to be to include all levels of government, the focus subsequently narrowed to the federal level."²¹ This is probably at least partly due to the fact that most of the educational products developed in response to the NSPD program have been established by the federal government at educational institutions operated by the federal government. So it's not surprising to find that these programs have a federal perspective on interagency problems. These educational programs include:

- National Defense University pilot program for national security professionals – this program was taught in the 2007-2008 academic year at three NDU campuses in 2007-2008: the National War College, the Industrial College of the Armed Forces and the Joint Forces

Staff College. This was a full time ten month, on-campus program. The students came from all the military services plus six non-DoD agencies of the Federal Government.²²

- Six one-week long courses currently offered by the National Defense University's Information Resources Management College for federal employees in the NSPD program.²³
- Three courses offered by the National Defense University's College of International Security Affairs for federal employees in the NSPD program.²⁴
- The Foreign Service Institute National Security Executive Leadership Seminar – this Department of State program involves two days per month for a five month period. Approximately half of the students in this program come from outside the Department of State and are at the GS-15 level or equivalent.²⁵
- Department of Defense Executive Leadership Development Program – this program is for DoD civilian employees (GS-12 to GS-14) and convenes one week per month for ten months. It involves two weeks in the classroom and the rest of the time in the program involves field visits around the world. While the students come from multiple services, the student body does not have significant interagency or interorganizational representation.²⁶
- Federal Emergency Management Agency on-line three hour course entitled “National Response Framework: An Introduction.” This course is open to employees of government agencies, non-governmental organizations and the public.²⁷

The Civilian Response Corps: In October 2008 Congress authorized the creation of the Civilian Response Corps (CRC), led by the Department of State's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). The purpose of the CRC is to have trained personnel from nine agencies of the Federal government (not including the Department of Defense) ready to go on short notice to apply “whole of U.S. government” capabilities to reconstruction and stabilization problems in other nations. Members of the CRC are required to take two to eight weeks of training per year depending on their membership category. This training includes courses such as, “Foundations of Interagency Reconstruction and Stabilization Operations (two weeks); and Whole-of-Government Planning for Reconstruction and Stabilization (three weeks).”²⁸

Unfortunately, Congress never fully funded the entire CRC concept, which included 250 active members, a 2,000 member standby team and a 2,000 member reserve component. By the end of 2010, the CRC had approximately 130 active members, 967 standby members and zero reserve members.²⁹ Furthermore, the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) has recently been abolished and replaced by the Assistant Secretary of State for Conflict and Stabilization Operations and Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (CSO). It is yet to be seen what impact this change may have on interagency training and education.

U.S. Naval Postgraduate School (NPS) Programs: One federal institution has reached out to multiple levels of government to offer interagency education and training: the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School (NPS). Much of the focus of this effort has been on homeland security. For example, the Center for Homeland Defense and Security at NPS offers the following programs:

- Master of Arts degree in Homeland Security – this 18 month program is taught using a combination of web-based distance learning and six two-week classroom sessions in residence at one of two physical locations in the United States. This program enrolls homeland security officials from all levels of government, including tribal, local, county, state and federal.³⁰
- The Fusion Center Leaders Program (FCLP) – a five day course for personnel from law enforcement and intelligence fusion centers at the local, state and federal levels and is offered approximately twice a year.³¹
- Homeland Security Executive Leaders Program – consists of four in-residence seminars at NPS each lasting four and a half days. This program enrolls homeland security leaders and managers from all levels of government, including tribal, local, county, state and federal.³²
- Executive Education Seminars – these are on-site, half day seminars for senior state officials and senior officials in large metropolitan areas about homeland security issues. Among the topics covered in some of these seminars is Federal/State/Local Responsibilities and Coordination.³³

Perhaps the broadest effort at interorganizational education at NPS has occurred in the Center for Stabilization and Reconstruction Studies (CSRS). Originally established in 2004 via a Congressional earmark for Congressman Sam Farr, the CSRS offers 2-4 day seminars on various topics several times a year. At each seminar, this program has been careful to ensure a broad mix of attendees from:

- U.S. uniformed services
- Department of Defense civilian employees
- Appropriate foreign Ministries of Defense
- Non-governmental organizations
- International organizations
- U.S. non-DoD federal government agencies
- Faculty in academia and think-tanks³⁴

The CSRS has offered seminars with a variety of themes, including security sector reform, demobilization and disarmament activities, post-conflict and stability operations, and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief activities. Unfortunately, CSRS has recently experienced some significant reductions in funding.

RECENT CHANGES TO THE NSPD PROGRAM AFFECTING INTERAGENCY EDUCATION AND TRAINING

In early 2011, the Obama administration made changes to the NSPD program. Called NSPD 2.0, it has a revised structure for managing the program and identifying government personnel to participate in the program. The scope of the overall effort was reduced to a single pilot program that would focus exclusively on the area of domestic emergency management. In addition,

the pilot program was limited to federal employees in the National Capitol Region and holding a grade in the GS-13 to GS-15 range. The Department of Homeland Security was given the task of developing the core requirements for education, training and rotational assignments across cabinet-level agency boundaries.³⁵

NSPD 2.0 has been somewhat controversial among officials with current or past responsibilities for the program. On the one hand, the selection of domestic emergency management as the focus area allows the NSPD program to take advantage of fairly robust "...existing collaboration mechanisms, and training and educational programs (in particular through FEMA's Emergency Management Institute)..."³⁶ On the other hand, "Some have expressed concern that the narrowing of the program's substantive focus might make it difficult to broaden that scope again in the future to include a wider array of national security-related concerns."³⁷

So while there are a number of individual efforts and scope-limited collective efforts to provide interagency education and training, these efforts are scattered, often oriented to one particular problem set and sometimes rather entrepreneurial. When compared to centrally and tightly controlling interagency education and training, the current situation seems to produce a wide variety of approaches to education and training opportunities, content and delivery methods. This has several disadvantages:

1. It makes it very difficult for federal, state and local government to determine if the right people are actually being exposed to the right interagency education and training.
2. It makes it hard to determine how much is spent overall on interagency education and training.
3. Most of these programs and events provide no or weak on-going means to develop professional networks that cross agency boundaries.
4. Non-governmental organizations, international organizations and some quasi-governmental organizations³⁸ do not have much access to this interagency education and training. Nor do they often have much access to means to develop professional networks across organizational boundaries.

THE INTERAGENCY SERVICE CLUB (IASC) CONCEPT

The Interagency Service Club concept provides opportunities for a broad range of people to have access to interagency education, training and on-going professional network development across agency boundaries. The IASC is specifically intended to address the last two disadvantages mentioned above. Patterned after the successful Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions club models, it provides a forum in which friendships can be developed and maintained across agency boundaries. It is also intended to greatly broaden access to interagency education and training for managers from governmental, non-governmental, international and quasi-governmental organizations. The concept is not intended to focus on one particular functional area (such as domestic emergency management

or post-conflict operations). However, individual clubs may initially form around a functional area of particular interest to the members.

Goals:

The primary goal of the Interagency Service Club (IASC) is to educate its members regarding capabilities, limitations, organizational cultures, missions, funding issues and legal authorities of governmental, international and nongovernmental organizations. It does so by providing a regular, local forum in which the members can learn about each other's organizations.

The second most important goal of the IASC is to afford its members the opportunity to develop their personal interagency and interorganizational social network. The knowledge and professional contacts gained by club members are likely to increase the ability of governmental and non-governmental organizations to respond to future crises.

The third goal of the IASC is to take on one or more service projects that meet unfilled needs related to the interagency and interorganizational communities.

Club Locations

Interagency service clubs can mostly easily be formed in areas that have a sufficient concentration of governmental, non-governmental, international and/or quasi-governmental organizations. To date, we have briefed the IASC concept to personnel from Washington, DC (which could host several such clubs), U.S. Special Operations Command, U.S. Central Command, U.S. Pacific Command, the U.S. Naval War College and the U.S. Naval Postgraduate School. The following locations could sustain one or more IASCs:

- Washington, DC
- Tampa, FL (USSOCCOM and USCENCOM)
- Miami, FL (USSOUTHCOM)
- Colorado Springs, CO (USNORTHCOM)
- Monterey, CA (DLIFLC and US Naval Postgraduate School)
- St. Louis, MO (USTRANCOM)
- Charleston, SC (Project Seahawk)
- Honolulu, HI (USPACOM)
- Stuttgart, Germany (USEUCOM and USAFRICOM)

Starting a local Interagency Service Club

Three or four people can start a local club. Startup tasks include:

- Recruiting appropriate people to an initial organizational meeting.
- Establishing a meeting place, date and time.
- Developing a set of club bylaws.³⁹

- Choosing club officers.⁴⁰
- Optional: applying for non-profit status with the IRS and the appropriate state authorities.

Membership Principles

The ideal membership mix of an IASC would include high-level, mid-level and entry-level managers/leaders in their respective organizations. It's also critically important to achieve a mix of people from a variety of agencies from across all levels of governmental, international and non-governmental organizations. The most beneficial mix of agencies would be those agencies that are likely to have to work together when a short or long term crisis such as Hurricane Katrina, the Haiti earthquake, the Indonesian Tsunami, the Loma Prieta earthquake, the Iraq war or the Afghan war arises.

The most challenging aspect of starting an IASC is likely to be recruiting the appropriate mix of members. When trying to recruit members, sometimes just obtaining contact information for personnel inside agencies other than your own is a difficult task. A specific IASC would not be very interagency in nature if 90% of its members were, for example, employees of the Department of Defense.

Here's one interesting aspect of the IASC concept: forming an IASC might be the one initiative in your career that can be implemented without seeking funding or formal approval from anyone in the government! And although obtaining tax exempt status does require governmental approvals, it's likely to be important only if you raise significant amounts of money for service projects. Otherwise, the club is simply a group of people who get together periodically to share a meal and hear a talk.

Membership Composition of an Interagency Service Club

Due to the availability, interests and affiliation of potential members in a given local area, the specific composition of each club will vary substantially. Here is a notional club having 75 members:

Agency	Number of Members
Active U. S. Army	3
Army Reserve and National Guard	3
Active Navy and Marine Corps	4
Active Air Force	4
Department of Defense civilians	2
Department of Homeland Security	5
Department of Veterans Affairs	1
Department of Justice	3
Department of Treasury	1
Department of Agriculture	2

Department of the Interior	1
Health and Human Services	1
Department of Transportation	1
Department of Commerce	1
Department of Labor	1
Department of Energy	1
Department of State	4
Department of Housing and Urban Development	1
NASA	1
Environmental Protection Agency	1
National Weather Service	1
General Services Administration	1
Federal judge or clerk	1
Member of Congress or staffer	2
State Department of Emergency Services	3
State Police Department	2
State Department of Veterans Affairs	1
State Department of Transportation	1
State Department of Environmental Protection	1
State Dept. of Community Services and Development	1
State Department of Health and Human Services	1
County Department of Emergency Services	2
County Sheriff lieutenant	1
County Director of Public Works	1
Local police lieutenant	2
City Director of Public Works	1
General Manager of the local water purveyor	1
General Manager, local wastewater treatment plant	1
Officer, local chapter of the American Red Cross	1
Community Emergency Response Team	1
Other local nongovernmental organizations	6
Civilians unaffiliated with any of the above	2

A composition specifically like this would be hard to achieve unless Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force bases and other Federal offices were nearby and the state and county had the particular departments mentioned in the list. If the IASC concept were to spread beyond areas having a heavy concentration of federal employees and military personnel, the local clubs would be heavily dominated by state, county and local officials. Regardless, for any given club the main membership goal is to achieve a broad interagency membership, one that is representative of all the locally available levels of government from local to federal and to include members from non-governmental, international and quasi-governmental organizations with personnel in the area.

It should also be noted that some states have a form of government that is considered local but is not considered county, city, town or village government. In California, this form of government is called a special district and they include fire districts, water districts, community services districts, cemetery districts and about 85 other types of districts. This form of local government should not be neglected since some of these organizations can play a significant role in a disaster or other crisis due to their mission, personnel, communications gear, capital equipment and/or training.

There is also a motive for having two members of the club who do not work for and may have never worked for any of the types of organizations mentioned so far. These members are intended to serve as a direct connection between the club and the broad civilian population those government agencies and other organizations serve. These members could bring particular perspective to the club and a point of view that might be valuable to government employees.

There are four additional categories of possible members that are underrepresented or not represented at all in this notional list. They are:

- Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs)
- International organizations (IOs)
- Government regulated private utility companies
- Government contractors.

In the New York and Washington, DC areas an Interagency Service Club should try to include a significant number of members from international organizations and from nongovernmental organizations. In U.S. Government operations overseas, these NGOs and IOs provide significant services, interact with the U.S. Government agencies there, and sometimes make demands on U.S. Government resources. Many of these NGOs and IOs have headquarters and a significant number of employees in New York and/or Washington, DC, making it possible for some of them to join the local IASC.

Representatives from regulated utilities should be considered for membership because of the role they would likely be called upon to play in a natural or manmade disaster. Finally, given the extent to which some government functions have been contracted out to private companies in recent years, it may be appropriate for some clubs to include in their membership a limited number of appropriately selected government contractors.

INTERAGENCY SERVICE CLUB TEMPLATE

Rather than force each local IASC to create from scratch its mission, structure, bylaws, agendas and traditions, a template for these things has been developed. Included in the template are features such as:

- Regular bimonthly meetings about 75 minutes in length. Each individual club decides whether to make these breakfast, lunch or dinner meetings. Each club decides on the specific date and time of these meetings. Individual clubs can also decide on a different frequency of meetings.
- Each meeting should feature an invited speaker whose topic is intended to expand the membership’s knowledge of governmental and non-governmental organizations, activities, capabilities, limitations and challenges.
- The template includes a generic meeting agenda:

Suggested duration	Activity
3 min.	Meeting Call to Order
30 min.	Meal and Fellowship Period
10 min.	President’s Time
	Introduction of guests and visiting members
	Correspondence and announcements
	Committee reports
	Club business
30 – 45 min.	Program
	Introduction of speaker
	Speaker’s presentation
	Questions from the audience
2 min.	Closing remarks by president/ Adjournment

- The template includes club bylaws that have:
 - Club mission and purpose statements
 - Duties and responsibilities of club officers and committees
 - Club membership composition guidelines and rules
- Suggested service projects. (Wounded warrior; wounded FSO, NGO employee or non-DoD employee; interagency educational outreach.)
- Some suggested traditions to establish:
 - Meeting seating rules that ensure each table contains members from multiple agencies.
 - A formal, annual business card exchange.
 - An annual report on the interagency education and training that has been accomplished by the club.
 - An annual “Internal Interagency Action Award” – for the local club member who has contributed the most during the past year to interagency education, training, professional network development and/or operations.
 - An annual “External Interagency Action Award” – for the non-member of the club in the local area who works for a governmental, non-governmental, international or

quasi-governmental organization and has made a significant contribution to interagency education, training, professional network development and/or operations.

INTERAGENCY SERVICE PROJECTS

Besides sharing a meal together, one of the ways to develop fellowship across interagency boundaries is to work together toward some common goal. Although the template suggests a few areas in which service projects might be developed, the members of the IASC will be perfectly able to creatively come up with specific projects that have an interagency flavor. Two examples are described below. These are intended to convey the concept of the “interagency service project.”

The Wounded Peacemaker Project

In the past decade in places such as Iraq, Afghanistan and elsewhere, many non-military U.S. personnel have deployed to do important work. These people have come from federal, state and local governments, non-governmental organizations, international organizations and quasi-governmental organizations. Their work has been intended to deter further warfare in these countries and to try to help the local populations achieve peace and improved living conditions. In the course of this work, some of these people have been killed or injured. When they arrive home there is often no flag draped coffin, veteran’s cemetery or VA medical center waiting for them. In the case of some such injured individuals, they can no longer do their job, must undergo months of rehabilitation and then try to find a job that they can do given their disability. The support systems for these individuals are significantly weaker than the support systems for military casualties. This project would help develop better support systems for these individuals.⁴¹

Interagency Speakers Bureau Project

This project would support civics education in the local area. The club would put together and offer to local high schools and colleges a directory of speakers and topics from the interagency domain.

THE INTERAGENCY CHALLENGE REVISITED

Effective, well funded interagency training and education will not by itself dispose of the interagency challenge, but it will help. Unfortunately, at least for the near term, it appears that the United States Congress does not have the will to pass legislation to comprehensively address the interagency challenge. So absent such a “Goldwater-Nichols Act” for interagency processes, interagency training, education and network building that can be accomplished with little or no Congressional support becomes a lot more important. Although very flexible, the Interagency Service Club concept is but one approach to interagency education, training and professional network building. If you would like to form one in your area, the author is available to answer your questions about the idea and share the template with you.

¹ Rotary International history accessed October 14, 2011, <http://www.rotary.org/en/AboutUs/History/Pages/ridefault.aspx>.

² Rotary International, accessed October 14, 2011, http://www.rotary.org/RIdocuments/en_pdf/memb_count_country_current.pdf.

³ Rotary International statistics as of April 30, 2011, accessed October 14, 2011, <http://www.rotary.org/en/AboutUs/RotaryInternational/ataglance/Pages/ridefault.aspx>.

⁴ Lions Clubs International, accessed October 14, 2011, <http://www.lionsclubs.org/EN/about-lions/fast-facts.php>.

⁵ Rotary International, accessed October 14, 2011, <http://www.rotary.org/en/AboutUs/RotaryInternational/GuidingPrinciples/Pages/ridefault.aspx>.

⁶ Lions Clubs International, accessed October 14, 2011, <http://www.lionsclubs.org/EN/about-lions/mission-and-history/our-mission.php>.

⁷ Richard H. Shultz, Jr., *In the Aftermath of War: U.S. Support for Reconstruction and Nation-Building in Panama Following Just Cause* (Maxwell AFB, Ala.: Air University Press, 1993), p. 18.

⁸ Project on National Security Reform, *Forging a New Shield* (Arlington, VA: Center for the Study of the Presidency, 2008), p. 17.

⁹ Iraq Study Group (U.S.), James Addison Baker, Lee Hamilton, and Lawrence S. Eagleburger, *The Iraq Study Group Report*, (New York: Vintage Books, 2006) p. 61.

¹⁰ Frederick M. Kaiser, *Interagency Collaborative Arrangements and Activities: Types, Rationales, Considerations*, Inter Agency Paper No. 5 (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Col. Arthur D. Simons Center for the Study of Interagency Coordination, June 2001), p. 13.

¹¹ “Secretary Napolitano was joined by U.S. Senator Lindsey Graham to announce the transition of responsibility for Project SeaHawk – a pilot project to enhance port security operations and coordination among Federal, state, and local agencies – from the Department of Justice (DOJ) to DHS on October 1, 2009. ‘Project SeaHawk is an innovative security program designed to increase our maritime security capabilities,’ said Secretary Napolitano. ‘By working with our state, local, and Federal partners we will improve overall situational awareness, increase information sharing and continue to collaborate to find more effective and efficient ways to protect our ports.’ Project SeaHawk was established by Congress in 2003 as a collaborative initiative designed to bring multiple agencies together to protect the port. Located at Port Charleston in South Carolina, SeaHawk enables Federal agencies to work together with South Carolina authorities to share information and coordinate maritime response efforts.” [U. S. Department of Homeland Security, *Secretary Napolitano Tours Project Seahawk*, Online Press Release (Washington, DC: July 6, 2009), Accessed October 19, 2011, http://www.dhs.gov/ynews/releases/pr_1246911374161.shtm.

¹² Kaiser, *Interagency Collaborative Arrangements and Activities*, p. 14.

¹³ For example, Department of Defense Joint Publication 3-08, *Interorganizational Coordination During Joint Operations*, 24 June 2011 contains descriptions of 12 international organizations and four nongovernmental organizations with which military forces may have to interact during crisis action planning and during execution of such a plan.

¹⁴ Organizations that responded to Hurricane Katrina included: the U.S. Navy, Louisiana Army National Guard, U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Federal Emergency Management Agency, Louisiana Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness, New Orleans Police Department, the American Red Cross, the Salvation Army, USA Freedom Corps, Citizen’s Corps Council, Catholic Charities USA, WalMart, AMTRAK, Jefferson Parish Sheriff’s Office, the Gretna City Police Department, and the Crescent City Connection Police, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), U.S. Department of Interior, U.S. Department of Treasury, U.S. Department of Veterans’ Affairs, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the U.S. Postal Inspection Service, U.S. Coast Guard and many more.

¹⁵ The White House, *The Federal Response to Hurricane Katrina: Lessons Learned, February, 2006* (Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2006), p. 49.

¹⁶ The “interorganizational challenge” has caused problems in Operation Just Cause/Blind Logic, Operation Iraq Freedom and its follow on operations, Operation Enduring Freedom and its follow on operations, Hurricane Katrina, the Haiti earthquake response, etc.

¹⁷ Use the word “planning” to a military member on the staff of an operational or tactical military organization and that military member will immediately think of the process in which we examine a problem, consider alternative

courses of action, select the best course of action and prepare the order needed to execute that course of action. Use the same English word to a member of the U.S. Agency for International Development and absent any additional context, they will think of the process used to obtain money from Congress.

¹⁸ William J. Davis, *Is a Sense of Community Vital to Interagency Coordination?*, Inter Agency Paper No. 3 (Fort Leavenworth, KS: Col. Arthur D. Simons Center for the Study of Interagency Coordination, January 2001), p. 10.

¹⁹ The White House, *National Strategy for the Development of Security Professionals* (Washington, DC: July, 2007), p. 2, <http://www.cpms.osd.mil/ASSETS/13DCDB52B7D7453A9F78343E46F11F99/National%20Strategy%20for%20Professional%20Development.pdf>

²⁰ Catherine Dale, *National Security Professionals and Interagency Reform: Proposals, Recent Experience and Issues for Congress*, CRS Report for Congress (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, September 26, 2011), p. 8.

²¹ Ibid, p. 9.

²² Ibid, p. 13.

²³ Information Resources Management College Course Offerings List, accessed November 1, 2011, http://www.ndu.edu/icollege/admis/course_offerings_11_class.html and NSPD Training and Education Portal, accessed October 31, 2011, <http://www.cpms.osd.mil/forms/lpdd/nspd/training/index.aspx>.

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ Dale, *National Security Professionals and Interagency Reform*, p. 14.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Ibid, p. 16.

²⁸ Department of State, accessed July 19, 2012, <http://www.civilianresponsecorps.gov/join/faq/index.htm#14>.

²⁹ Samuel S. Farr, "Standing Up the Civilian Response Corps: From Idea to Implementation," *Prism* 2 (12/2010): 22.

³⁰ Center for Homeland Defense and Security, accessed November 1, 2011, <http://www.chds.us/?masters/overview>.

³¹ Ibid, <http://www.chds.us/?special/info&pgm=FCLP>.

³² Ibid, <http://www.chds.us/?special/info&pgm=Exec>.

³³ Ibid, <http://www.chds.us/?met>.

³⁴ Center for Stabilization and Reconstruction Studies, accessed November 1, 2011, http://www.csrns-nps.org/logistica/public/docs/CSRS_Brochure_March_2011.pdf.

³⁵ Dale, *National Security Professionals and Interagency Reform*, p. 20.

³⁶ Ibid, p. 21.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ By quasi-governmental organizations we mean organizations that provide some sort of government service or services under contract to or under the regulation of some part of the local, county, state or federal government.

³⁹ You will find a template for this purpose at: <http://www.interagencyclubs.org>.

⁴⁰ A president, vice president, treasurer, secretary, venue coordinator and speaker coordinator are the suggested club officers.

⁴¹ Medical coverage, long term care, dependent care, rehabilitation training, disability income and life insurance programs are examples of these support systems.