



**Testimony of
The Honorable Jane Holl Lute
Deputy Secretary
U.S. Department of Homeland Security**

**Before the
House Committee on Homeland Security
Subcommittee on Management, Investigations and
Oversight**

April 29, 2010

Chairman Carney, Ranking Member Bilirakis, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to appear before you to discuss the recently completed Quadrennial Homeland Security Review (QHSR).

The QHSR represents the most comprehensive strategic assessment of homeland security to date, and it has set forth a vision and framework that will shape the strategic direction of homeland security for the next four years and guide all homeland security stakeholders toward common goals and objectives. Today, I'd like to describe the major findings and results of the QHSR, outline the approach we took in executing the review, and articulate some of the lessons learned along the way that we hope will inform the next QHSR.

Secretary Napolitano and I are particularly proud of the substantive and consistent engagement with our federal, state, local, tribal, and non-governmental partners that produced this first QHSR. This robust collaboration added immeasurable value to the analysis and reinforced a foundational theme of the review that I will address shortly—that homeland security is a vast enterprise which extends well beyond just the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), leveraging capabilities and capacities that reside across all levels of government, the private and non-governmental sectors, and among the communities and citizens of this country.

Introduction

As the subcommittee is aware, Section 2401 of the *Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007* amends Title VII of the *Homeland Security Act of 2002* to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a QHSR every four years beginning in 2009. Congress was clear that the QHSR should delineate a homeland security strategy, including an outline of priority mission areas. The QHSR legislation also sought to better understand the resource and organizational implications of a new strategic view of homeland security. What we quickly discovered, however, was that any articulation of strategy or analysis of specific programmatic or resource tradeoffs—either within DHS or across the broader homeland security enterprise—had to be firmly rooted within a comprehensive understanding of homeland security. This understanding remained somewhat elusive, as questions like “What is homeland security?”; “How is the homeland best secured?”; and, “What does it mean to be prepared?” still echoed widely among homeland security stakeholders eight years after 9/11.

To that end, the submission of the QHSR Report to Congress on Feb. 1, 2010 marked an important first step in a multi-step process to examine and address fundamental issues that concern homeland security. The QHSR describes the nation's homeland security interests, identifies the critical homeland security enterprise missions, and ultimately defines a strategic approach to those missions by laying out the principal goals, essential objectives, and key strategic outcomes necessary for that strategic approach to succeed. A bottom-up review (BUR) of the Department of Homeland Security was initiated in November 2009 as an immediate follow on and complement to the congressionally mandated QHSR, with the aim of aligning DHS' programmatic activities and organizational structure with the broader mission sets and goals identified in the QHSR.

The BUR represents an intermediate substantive follow-on step to the QHSR and the results will be reflected in the President's 2012 budget submission and the DHS FY2012-2016 Future Years Homeland Security Program. These documents will propose specific programmatic and resource adjustments.

It is also important to note that the QHSR is not an assessment of the strategy, policy or resource allocations of the Department of Homeland Security. By no means was this an internal review of DHS or a resource prioritization document. Rather, the QHSR was a strategic analysis that is already serving as a basis for a deeper review of the full range of homeland security enterprise missions.

QHSR Results

The QHSR has resulted in a new strategic framework and a positive, forward-looking vision for homeland security: *A homeland that is safe, secure, and resilient against terrorism and other hazards where American interests, aspirations, and way of life can thrive.* The QHSR acknowledges existing relationships, roles and responsibilities, and seeks to set forth a shared vision of homeland security in order to achieve unity of purpose going forward.

As referenced in my introduction, the QHSR introduces the concept of the *homeland security enterprise* to capture the collective efforts and shared responsibilities of federal, state, local, tribal, territorial, nongovernmental, and private-sector partners—as well as individuals, families, and communities—to maintain critical homeland security capabilities.. The term “enterprise” connotes a broad-based community with a common interest in the public safety and well being of America and American society that is composed of multiple actors and stakeholders whose roles and responsibilities are distributed and shared.

Second, in conceptualizing a new strategic framework for the homeland security enterprise, several conclusions or principles provided necessary context. The QHSR takes a more comprehensive approach to homeland security threats by expanding the focus of homeland security to specifically address high-consequence weapons of mass destruction; Al-Qaida and global violent extremism; mass cyber attacks, intrusions, and disruptions; pandemics and natural disasters; and illegal trafficking and related transnational crime.

Third, the QHSR identifies three key concepts essential to the foundation of homeland security and relevant to all homeland security activities:

- Security: Protecting the United States and its people, vital interests, and way of life
- Resilience: Fostering individual, community, and system robustness, adaptability, and capacity for rapid recovery.
- Customs and Exchange: Expediting and enforcing lawful trade, travel, and immigration.

All homeland security activities must be built upon a foundation of ensuring security and resilience in the normal, daily activities of society and interchange with the world.

Informed by these principles, the QHSR Strategic Framework grounds homeland security in five missions and their associated goals and objectives that more completely capture the universe of activities required to achieve homeland security.

<p>Mission 1: Preventing Terrorism and Enhancing Security</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 1.1: Prevent Terrorist Attacks • Goal 1.2: Prevent the Unauthorized Acquisition or Use of Chemical, Biological, Radiological, and Nuclear Materials and Capabilities • Goal 1.3: Manage Risks to Critical Infrastructure, Key Leadership, and Events
<p>Mission 2: Securing and Managing Our Borders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 2.1: Effectively Control U.S. Air, Land, and Sea Borders • Goal 2.2: Safeguard Lawful Trade and Travel • Goal 2.3: Disrupt and Dismantle Transnational Criminal Organizations
<p>Mission 3: Enforcing and Administering Our Immigration Laws</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 3.1: Strengthen and Effectively Administer the Immigration System • Goal 3.2: Prevent Unlawful Immigration
<p>Mission 4: Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 4.1: Create a Safe, Secure, and Resilient Cyber Environment • Goal 4.2: Promote Cybersecurity Knowledge and Innovation
<p>Mission 5: Ensuring Resilience to Disasters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal 5.1: Mitigate Hazards • Goal 5.2: Enhance Preparedness • Goal 5.3: Ensure Effective Emergency Response • Goal 5.4: Rapidly Recover

Figure 1. The Homeland Security Missions and Goals

This framework recognizes that all-hazards emergency management is part of homeland security, and restores “mitigating hazards” as a strategic aim for *Ensuring Resilience to Disasters*. In addition, the framework acknowledges the vital importance of *Enforcing and Administering Immigration Laws* and *Safeguarding and Securing Cyberspace* by elevating these efforts to core homeland security missions.

The QHSR also emphasizes the importance of maturing and strengthening the homeland security enterprise in recognition of the critically important functional capabilities that support the mission priorities outlined above. The goals in this area include:

- Enhance Shared Awareness of Risks and Threats
- Build Capable Communities
- Foster Unity of Effort
- Foster Innovative Approaches and Solutions Through Leading-Edge Science and Technology

QHSR Structure and Approach

As I indicated previously, the QHSR benefited from the constructive engagement of thousands of dedicated individuals from across the country and, indeed, around the globe, including the key officials of DHS, the heads of other federal agencies, and other relevant governmental and nongovernmental entities, including state, local, tribal, and territorial governments, as well as the broader public at large. Although numbers alone cannot capture the depth and vibrancy of the debates and discussions that occurred throughout the process of preparing the QHSR, the process engaged more than 100 stakeholder associations and several hundred experts from government at all levels, as well as academia and the private sector. Our online National Dialogues had over 20,000 visits, with over 3,000 comments submitted.

The core of the QHSR approach was the formation of seven study groups that consisted of over 200 participants from 42 DHS directorates, components, and offices. The study groups were each led by a DHS official and facilitated by an independent subject-matter expert, both of whom ensured that all viewpoints were aired and that divergent opinions were brought forward. The study groups conducted their analyses over a five-month period, and consistently shared work products with the other stakeholder groups via multiple collaboration processes.

A Steering Committee, chaired by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy (Strategic Plans) and consisting of the leads and facilitators of each study group, ensured consistency and integration across the review and raised issues for leadership consideration. At the conclusion of the study group deliberation period, I convened more than a dozen senior leadership meetings to review and reach concurrence on study group recommendations. Final decisions on the recommendations reflected departmental acknowledgement of the major themes around which the QHSR report was written.

DHS also worked closely and consistently with the White House, National Security Staff and other federal departments and agencies to refine the QHSR and ensure consistency with national strategy and other major security reviews, including the Quadrennial Defense Review and the Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review. Key mechanisms for interagency coordination included six special sub-Interagency Policy Committees established by the National Security Staff to provide a forum for interagency input on study group work products, and a Strategy Coordination Group which provided

strategy and policy planners from across the government an opportunity to share perspectives and provide feedback throughout the process. Congress was kept apprised of QHSR status and process through testimony by the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy (Strategic Plans) at the outset of the review, and through 17 briefings to congressional staff, including multiple briefings to staff of the House Homeland Security Committee, the Senate Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, and the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees on Homeland Security, as well as briefings to staff of the House Energy and Commerce Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Senate Commerce Committee, and the Senate Judiciary Committee.

To ensure the broadest possible outreach to critical State, local, and tribal partners as well as the general public, the Secretary of Homeland Security invited 118 homeland security stakeholder organizations representing state, local, tribal, territorial, nongovernmental, and private-sector interests, to submit papers and other materials relating to the QHSR study areas at the outset of the review. Over 40 position papers were received and disseminated to study groups, and these papers helped to frame and inform their deliberations. This *early engagement* of homeland security stakeholders at the beginning of the review process was a critical element of the QHSR.

Secondly, in a groundbreaking initiative, DHS held three online, collaborative “National Dialogue on the QHSR” sessions to capture the direct input and perspectives of a wide array of participants across the homeland security enterprise. The National Dialogues were open to anyone who wanted to provide input on QHSR content, although DHS engaged in deliberate outreach to several hundred organizations with interests in homeland security. As I stated earlier, over the course of three dialogues, more than 20,000 visits were logged, resulting in over 3,000 comments on study group material. National Dialogue comments and content ratings were provided to the study groups who used the information to inform their iterative deliberations throughout the analytic period of the review. Revised study group materials were posted on each subsequent dialogue, demonstrating how materials evolved over the course of the review and showing participants how their comments informed study group work.

Lastly, the Secretary convened the leadership of ten key stakeholder associations that are broadly representative of state, local, tribal, and territorial governments to form a “virtual” QHSR Executive Committee.¹ DHS held monthly teleconferences with the Executive Committee throughout the analytic phase of the review to keep these organizations apprised of review progress. These organizations also participated in the collaborative events DHS held throughout the review, such as Secretary Napolitano’s call for comment at the beginning of the review and the three National Dialogue sessions. Finally, on Nov. 19, 2009, Secretary Napolitano met in person with leadership

¹ The Executive Committee consisted of the leaders of the following organizations: the National Governors Association, the Council of State Governments, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the National League of Cities, the National Association of Counties, the National Council of State Legislatures, the National Congress of American Indians, the International City/County Management Association, the National Emergency Management Association, and the International Association of Emergency Managers.

representatives of the Executive Committee organizations to share key findings and recommendations of the QHSR. This in-person meeting provided key stakeholder organizations the opportunity to comment on QHSR findings and recommendations in a similar manner to, and at a similar time as, federal department and agency leadership.

Lessons Learned and Next Steps

As we look toward the next QHSR, I would like to share with you a few lessons learned. First, future Quadrennial Reviews should not be conducted in transition years. Senior leadership engagement and support is critical to any planning process of this scale, and the timeline of the transition process creates significant challenges in the critically important conceptualization and launch phases of a review. Based on the foundation set by the 2009 QHSR, the next QHSR will involve significant analytics during both the preparatory and early phases of the review, which must be conducted with full buy-in and awareness of senior leadership.

In addition, the other major quadrennial reviews, including the Quadrennial Defense Review and Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review, among others, must be synchronized. Today's security environment demands whole of government solutions and flexible and adaptable policy responses to difficult challenges. Quadrennial reviews offer an important opportunity to pause and ensure the strategy is right and the organization is aligned. We must find ways to do this in a way that meaningfully leverages the knowledge of each relevant department and agency, as well as stakeholders beyond the federal government.

Lastly, though the QHSR succeeded in breaking down bureaucratic and other barriers to large-scale engagement with the public, there is still more we can do. The technology and the tools are there for government to significantly enhance representative policymaking and we must facilitate the use of such tools across the government.

Conclusion

The QHSR has been an incredibly valuable endeavor, both for the results I've outlined here today, as well as the path we took in getting here. It has already generated significant follow-on analysis and examination within DHS, including the results of the BUR that will be reflected in the 2012 President's budget submission, and other important efforts to improve DHS strategic management and analysis. We can be confident that the homeland security enterprise will proceed over the next four years with a clear sense of purpose and a common understanding of the mission at hand.

I look forward to addressing any questions that you may have. Thank you.