

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**



NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE

Minutes of November 2017 Commission Meeting

The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (the Commission) held a meeting on November 16-17, 2017. The meeting occurred at the Commission's offices at 2900 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA 22202. The meeting concerned organizational and other pre-decisional and deliberative matters and was closed to the public pursuant to Public Law 114-328, section 554(b)(3). The Commissioners agreed to make a separate version of these minutes available to the public.

Attendance

Commissioners present:

- Mr. Edward T. Allard III
- Mr. Steve Barney
- The Honorable Janine Davidson (11/17 only)
- The Honorable Mark Gearan (arrived at 1340 on 11/16)
- Ms. Avril Haines (11/16 only)
- The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck
- Ms. Jeanette James (except for early part of 11/17)
- Mr. Alan Khazei
- Mr. Thomas Kilgannon (intermittently by telephone on 11/17)
- Ms. Shawn Skelly
- The Honorable Debra Wada

Others present:

- Kent Abernathy, Executive Director
- Paul Lekas, General Counsel
- Gregory Brinsfield, Director of Operations (present intermittently)
- Rachel Rikleen, Deputy General Counsel (present intermittently)
- Yolanda Hands, Operations Program Manager
- Peter Morgan, Deputy Director of Operations (present intermittently)
- Jill Rough, incoming Director of Research and Analysis

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

- Keri Lowry, incoming Director of Governmental and Public Engagement (present for portion of 11/17)
- LTC Marc Austin, OUSD(P&R), Office of Manpower & Reserve Affairs (present for portion of 11/16)

November 16, 2017 Session

At approximately 0900, Chairman Heck called the meeting to order. The Chairman then moved to make the meeting closed to the public because it would address pre-decisional and organizational matters. All Commissioners present agreed.

Approval of Minutes

The Chairman led a discussion about the proposed minutes for the Commission's October 2017 meeting. Following this discussion, the Commission voted unanimously to approve the October 2017 minutes as amended.

Administrative Update

Mr. Abernathy provided an update on the Commission staff. He informed the Commission that individuals had been selected for the positions of Director of Research and Analysis and Director of Governmental and Public Engagement. He provided an update on the hiring process and office setup, and then reviewed the agenda for this month's meeting.

Operations Update

Mr. Brinsfield introduced Commissioners to two new staff members: Peter Morgan, Deputy Director of Operations; and Yolanda Hands, Operations Program Manager.

Mr. Brinsfield briefed Commissioners on the status of operations. He began by addressing the status of information technology services. He explained that his team had met with Amazon Web Services, Google, and AT&T to discuss possible solutions, and that discussions with the DoD Joint Service Provider continue. He explained some of the challenges associated with both government and non-governmental vendors. Mr. Brinsfield noted that his team would also explore working with the Department of Interior for contracting capability to facilitate an arrangement with a non-governmental vendor.

Legal Update & Ethics Training

Mr. Lekas introduced Rachel Rikleem, the Commission's new Deputy General Counsel. Mr. Lekas explained that he and Ms. Rikleem would provide Commissioners with an ethics training module at each Commissioner meeting. Thereafter, Ms. Rikleem led an ethics training for Commissioners focused on outside activities.

Following ethics training, Mr. Lekas informed the Commission that Chairman Heck and Mr. Barney would be planning a meeting with SASC and HASC leadership to address the question of the Commission establishment date, and that Mr. Lekas had concluded as a legal matter that the

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Commission was established on September 19, 2017, when Commissioners were formally appointed and the Commission had an appropriation to carry out its work.

Mr. Lekas and Ms. Rikleen then briefed Commissioners on the financial disclosure program and informed Commissioners that they would reach out to individual Commissioners to finalize financial disclosure paperwork.

90-Day Outlook

Mr. Abernathy briefed the Commission on the 90-day outlook. He highlighted several key actions likely to occur in this period, notably the formal rollout for the Commission. Other events include the detailing of Sandy Scott of the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) to the Commission staff; website development; developing partnership opportunities; and securing key infrastructure, including official email accounts and VoIP phones. Mr. Abernathy introduced Jill Rough, who was selected to serve as Director of Research and Analysis.

Rollout Plan and Short-Term Commission Engagements

The discussion of the 90-day outlook focused on the Commission's formal rollout plan.

Chairman Heck requested Commissioners' views on holding a rollout event in January, in the week of MLK Jr. Day, also known as the National Day of Service. Mr. Abernathy noted the logistical challenges associated with holding the rollout event in January versus February. Recognizing possible constraints, Mr. Abernathy asked Commissioners when in an ideal world they would want to hold the rollout event. Commissioners acknowledged the logistical challenges, particularly the need to develop a functional website that would be capable of receiving comments from the public in time for the rollout. Following deliberations, Commissioners decided to target a rollout event on Thursday, January 18, 2018, in the Washington, DC area. Commissioners further agreed to hold two public events: first, a rollout press event with guest speakers, to include members of the Senate and House Armed Services Committees and others; second, a public meeting. Following the public meeting, Commissioners would convene with staff in a closed session.

During the course of deliberations, Commissioners made a number of observations regarding the form, substance, and objectives of the rollout event. The following records some of the more salient observations made during the deliberation.

- Several Commissioners expressed a view that the content of the public meeting should be guided by information needs identified by the Director of Research and Analysis, Dr. Rough. Dr. Rough expressed a view that at this early stage, it may be advisable to focus the public meeting on the Commission's needs with respect to outreach and public engagement. To this end, it was suggested that the public meeting demonstrate how the Commission intends to engage with the public and achieve the listening part of its mission.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

- Several Commissioners expressed a view that the rollout event should include speakers not closely identified with the Hill or the Federal government.
- A number of potential speakers, in addition to the key congressional members, were mentioned. They included young people in service; recent alums from service programs; Stanley McChrystal, currently Chair of Service Year Alliance; Robert Burckhardt, a member of the first Peace Corps class and founder of the Eagle Rock School; a representative from the White House; and people who can tell stories about service.
- A number of potential venues were considered. They included the Hill; the National Press Club; the United States Institute for Peace; and a local university or school. Commissioners agreed that the two rollout events should occur at the same location or sufficiently nearby each other.

Following the rollout event, Commissioners recommended holding smaller sessions in locations where Commissioners reside—for example, the Boston area, the West Coast, and New York—attended by two or three Commissioners and one representative from the Commission staff. The purposes of the events would be to introduce further the Commission, to engage with the public, and to gather data relevant for the Commission’s assessment. Commissioners tasked the Director of Research and Analysis and other senior Commission staff with developing a standardized agenda and model that could be used for these events.

Chairman Heck and Mr. Abernathy also recommended that the staff create a “Commission 101” slide deck that could be used for one-off engagements with the public.

The Commission revisited these topics in a session on Friday, November 17.

DoD Report on the Selective Service System

Representatives from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) requested a meeting with the Commission to discuss the Commission’s views on the report on the military selective service system (MSSS) prepared by DoD pursuant to the Commission’s enabling statute. The statute further charged GAO with preparing an assessment of the DoD report.

The Commission scheduled a meeting with GAO for Friday, November 17, to discuss the DoD report. To prepare for that meeting, Commissioners discussed a series of questions provided by GAO.

Generally, Commissioners agreed that the DoD report did not provide sufficient detail regarding a number of questions set out in the statute. In particular, the report did not address future needs that may warrant a draft; did not sufficiently support certain asserted indirect benefits of the MSSS, such as the DoD position that registering with the MSSS reminds the public about military service; did not elucidate the costs associated with DoD assuming the responsibilities of the Selective Service System; did not examine or propose modifications to the current MSSS system; did not address data regarding a potential requirement that women register with the MSSS; did not reflect any input that DoD could have obtained from discussions with the Military

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Departments; and seemed to assume that the United States would never have cause to make use of the draft.

Commissioners agreed that these matters would require further examination by the Commission. Ms. Haines pointed out that realistically, given that it would likely be challenging for DoD to recommend specific modifications to the existing MSSS system without clearances from outside of DoD that would take quite a bit of time, it may be better to engage DoD briefers on this question, rather than insist on further specificity in the report. It was noted that during the December meeting, the Commission would receive a threat briefing from DoD. Ms. Haines suggested contacting the Director of National Intelligence for a threat assessment and its view on whether MSSS registration constitutes a deterrent to U.S. adversaries.

Commissioners identified the following other areas for further briefings and follow up requests:

- The decision to allow women to serve in combat roles, particularly the views of the Army and Marine Corps as reflected in their studies;
- Pros and cons of women registering for the draft, as told by supporters for both sides;
- The conscription process and what happens following the arrival of a draftee at a Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS);
- An assessment of studies relied on by DoD in its report;
- Experience of other countries who have mandatory service requirements, including countries that draft women or otherwise include them in their mandatory service requirements;
- The replacement of combat troops as the end purpose of the draft;
- The growing military-civilian gap in the United States;
- Potential citizenship requirement proposals for natural born citizens; and
- Historical effectiveness of the draft.

CNCS Presentation

Acting Chief of Staff Mikel Herrington and Deputy Chief of Program Operations Erin Dahlin of the Corporation for National and Community Service (CNCS) briefed the Commission on CNCS' mission and programs. Ahead of the presentation, CNCS distributed the slide deck included in Addendum A. The following notes are intended to supplement the slide deck with salient points from Mr. Herrington and Ms. Dahlin's presentation.

With respect to how CNCS views "national service" and "community service" as used in its organizational name, Ms. Dahlin explained that national service means a longer-term, sustained commitment to serve something bigger, and community service means service in the community that tends to be shorter term and episodic.

Ms. Dahlin explained that the AmeriCorps program has 75,000 members at 25,000 sites. When asked about the cost to fund fully all grant applications, Mr. Herrington explained that the

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

answer is not clear-cut and would require further analysis. Separately, Mr. Herrington said he did not know the cost to fund all state programs and would find out.

Ms. Dahlin then discussed the different AmeriCorps programs, beginning with State and National. The State and National program is direct service. It involves public-private partnerships, most of which bring back 63 cents per \$1 spent. After several years, the program funds itself: grantees return about \$1 for every \$1 spent. In 2016, CNCS raised \$1.3 billion against an appropriation of \$1.0 billion.

The AmeriCorps Vista program is an indirect service program. According to Ms. Dahlin, one in every three applicants is accepted into the program (25,000 applicants for 8,000 positions), and the average age of members is 28. CNCS has seen a 14% increase in applications to the Vista program.

The AmeriCorps National Civilian Community Corps (NCCC) program is a team-based program designed to meet short-term needs and work on short-term projects. The acceptance rate is approximately one for every three applicants, although Ms. Dahlin noted that the data do not reflect the possibility that a single individual will apply for multiple programs.

The SeniorCorps program is the largest CNCS program by far. It has somewhere between 230,000 and 270,000 participants at 35,000 different sites.

CNCS has approximately 3000 grantees and public-private partnerships with many corporate sponsors. When asked about how CNCS develops partnerships, Ms. Dahlin explained that CNCS has no dedicated solicitation team; rather, corporations tend to approach CNCS. CNCS does engage in matchmaking between grantees and corporations though typically once the corporations have already indicated an interest to CNCS.

In terms of advertising, the onus is on the local organizations to recruit. CNCS has, since its inception and through today, faced branding challenges because of the double branding – national and local organizations – issue. CNCS is like a \$1 billion foundation – and is the largest funder of service programs in the country.

CNCS does have studies that demonstrate the impact of its programs. CNCS will ensure these are made available for Dr. Rough and also put her in contact with the CNCS Director of Research and Evaluation, Mary Hyde. CNCS also offered to provide data on other topics, noting that its demographic data are limited because, for AmeriCorps, only about 10% of members provide such information on a voluntary basis.

Commissioners asked the CNCS representatives how they determine “success” for a grantee. During the grant process, a grantee organization identifies performance metrics that will be used to assess performance. The organization establishes its own goals with CNCS assistance, and evidence-based programming is a requirement. CNCS assesses the organization’s success over the three-year life of the grant.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Commissioners asked about barriers to volunteer opportunities. Mr. Herrington identified two key barriers: the bureaucracy and funding. He explained that these barriers concern opportunities that CNCS offers. The bureaucratic challenges, such as compliance requirements, tend to turn off a lot of people and organizations, according to Mr. Herrington.

Commissioners asked about ways to increase the propensity of young people to serve. Mr. Herrington stressed the importance of clearly messaging to young people that serving in some capacity is good for the country. This requires advertising and external affairs, both of which are funded minimally at CNCS.

SSS Presentation

Donald M. Benton, Director of the Selective Service System (SSS), provided the Commission with a briefing on the SSS. Mr. Benton was accompanied by John Prigmore, Deputy Director; Rudy Sanchez, General Counsel; Adam “AJ” Copp, Associate Director, Operations and Information Technology; and Wadi Yahkour, Executive Officer to the Director.

Mr. Benton indicated at the outset that the SSS stood ready to help the Commission in any way and would provide the Commission with any information it required to make its recommendations.

Mr. Benton then discussed the SSS’ vision, mission, and strategic goals, as set out on his slide presentation. He explained that the SSS has 125 paid employees – 56 of whom are part-time state directors – and 10,875 volunteers who man the local, district, and national boards. SSS maintains the fourth largest database in the Federal government, which has presented a significant concern about cybersecurity. The SSS has not seen a dollar increase in its budget since 1983. The budget currently stands at \$22.7 million.

Mr. Benton briefed the Commission on the two main objectives of the SSS: registration and readiness.

Registration. According to Mr. Benton, 70-73% of males register for the SSS at the age of 18. This figure increases notably around the age of 20, and taken as a whole, 92% of the 18-25 year old cohort has registered. The high percentage of registrants and the spikes subsequent to the 18th year is likely a result of requiring registration to gain certain governmental benefits. Principal among these are student loans and drivers licenses. The SSS has an MOU with the Department of Education requiring registration to qualify for Federal loans, and 40 states have legislation requiring registration to obtain a driver’s license. States that do not require registration to issue drivers’ licenses show significantly lower rates of registration. Those states include California, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts. In California, for example, 56% of males are registered at the age of 18, going up to about 70% at the age of 19, and increasing thereafter but never approaching the 92% mark that is the country’s average. Mr. Benton also noted that states or territories with significant public transit systems show lower overall rates of registration. In the District of Columbia, the registration rate is low even though D.C. requires registration to issue drivers’ licenses. Mr. Benton indicated that the SSS does not engage in

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

public service announcement campaigns, as funds for that purpose are no longer part of its budget.

Readiness. Mr. Benton explained the requirements that SSS deliver the first inductee to MEPS at N+193 and the 100,000th inductee to MEPS at N+210. He also talked about the mass registration of healthcare professionals – 3.5 million covering 60 specialties. The first professional must be registered at N+193, and induction to occur at N+214. Mr. Benton indicated that the SSS would be conducting a quiet in-house mock lottery test this year to assess the ability of the system to meet its readiness requirements.

Commissioners raised a number of questions about the SSS' readiness obligations with respect to healthcare professionals. Mr. Benton said that state and professional licensing departments and boards would be used to identify healthcare professionals. Legislation authorizes the SSS to have a plan for identifying healthcare professionals, but does not flesh out how the SSS should meet the manpower requirements. Further, the SSS has no agreements with any licensing department or board. Mr. Benton indicated that legislation would be needed to assist the SSS for a potential need to achieve readiness with respect to healthcare professionals. The current plan for healthcare mobilization has not been updated in a long time – possibly 50 years – but Mr. Benton said he would provide it to the Commission.

Commissioners also raised a number of questions about the alternative service program (ASP). The ASP provides for alternative service arrangements for conscientious objectors. Mr. Copp said the ASP program exists mainly in theory, and requires a conscription environment to be considered in practice. He suggested the Departments of Labor and Interior would need to be involved. Currently, the SSS has some top-level MOUs with Federal agencies and also has MOUs with some peace churches. However, none of the MOUs is binding. The SSS maintains relationships with the different agencies and non-governmental organizations. Mr. Sanchez indicated that the SSS director would be responsible for deciding what types of jobs would be included in the ASP program. Mr. Benton noted that ASP would be used to backfill jobs vacated by conscripted individuals, for example park rangers, with conscientious objectors.

Chairman Heck asked how Mr. Benton would modernize the SSS. Mr. Benton said the registration form should require email addresses and phone numbers; there should be manpower to help reach people; and the SSS should have a better IT system.

Mr. Benton addressed objections raised by the ten states that do not have legislation requiring registration with the SSS as a condition to receiving a driver's license. Mr. Benton said that while the objections run the gamut, there are two main objections: one, some states view the SSS as a tool to recruit poor people for war; two, some states do not want the U.S. government interference.

Mr. Benton then addressed the question of women registering with the SSS. He said the SSS has done some preliminary work but otherwise lacks the resources to do much to study how the system would need to be changed to permit women to register. He suggested the SSS would need to double its budget to accommodate women registration and potential mobilization. He

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

deferred to the Commission on the policy questions about women registering for the draft. Currently, a woman cannot register. Mr. Copp explained that the system requires each individual to state whether they are male or female, using the gender identified on their birth certificate; the system will reject any potential registrant who indicates “female.”

Mr. Khazei asked why Mr. Benton took the Director position. He explained that he had worked with the Trump campaign in Washington State and offered to help. He served some months at the Environmental Protection Agency after which President Trump asked him to serve as SSS Director.

Chairman Heck inquired about data provided by the SSS to DoD each month, which DoD used in its recruiting efforts. Mr. Benton did not believe that the SSS provided DoD with data each month, but agreed to follow up.

On November 17, Mr. Benton sent the below message to follow up on questions raised during his briefing:

I wanted to follow up on a couple of requests from yesterday’s discussion between the Commission and the Selective Service. I expect soon you’ll have a formal process for “Requests for Information” via your WEB page, but I thought a quick shot over to you with some answers would be in order today. Please share my responses with the members.

First –Your Chairman, Dr. Heck, asked about SSS data sharing with respect to recruiting efforts in the Department of Defense. Apparently I had the wrong information, we do share our names and addresses with DOD. In fact, the law requires us to. I apologize for any confusion.

Per 50 U.S.C. 3813, “In order to assist the Armed Forces in recruiting individuals for voluntary service in the Armed Forces, the Director of Selective Service shall, upon the request of the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of Homeland Security, furnish to the Secretary the names and addresses of individuals registered under this Act. Names and addresses furnished pursuant to the preceding sentence may be used by the Secretary of Defense or Secretary of Homeland Security only for recruiting purposes.” A reminder that Coast Guard is DHS, not DoD. We do share registration data on a monthly basis with both Departments for their recruiting purposes, and only for their recruiting purposes.

Second – Health Care Professional Delivery System – I believe Chairman Heck, Ms. Wada, and Ms. Haines asked about the Health Care Personnel Delivery. I have attached the 1988/98 NDAA that addresses post- mobilization registration of health care professionals. Remember that DoD does not have a requirement for this plan, and we are not funded to build, maintain, or sustain a HCPDS.

Third – I believe it was Mr. Kilgannon that asked about the amount of female representation on local boards. [Note: The question was raised by a different commissioner.] My initial assessment is that approximately 36% of our current local board membership is female.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

I hope this sufficiently answers the questions that were raised. Thank you for the opportunity to present the fundamentals of our organization to the Commission. I sincerely hope the members found the presentation informative and useful. We stand ready to provide any additional answers to any questions the Commission may have.

Planning for December Meeting

Commissioners deliberated the structure and content of the next Commission meeting, scheduled for December 14-15. Already scheduled is a threat briefing for December 14. Commissioners suggested the following selective service and military service-oriented briefings be considered for December or another near-term meeting:

- Army and Marine Corps on WISR;
- Intelligence community on the draft as a deterrent for adversaries;
- Intelligence community on threats;
- Army, as Executive Agent for the MEPS program, on what happens after SSS delivers recruits to MEPS;
- Military recruiting efforts by each military department;
- Representatives from foreign governments that require or permit military service registration or conscription by women;
- DoD on critical MOSs.

Commissioners suggested inviting the PeaceCorps to brief the Commission in December. Commissioners also suggested a number of public service-oriented organizations be considered for December and future briefings, including City Year, Teach For America, YouthBuild, Service Year Alliance, Voices for America, the United Way, the Knights of Columbus, the Red Cross, Medecins Sans Frontieres, and the Core Network, with preference (at this stage) for Service Year Alliance and Voices for America.

The November 16, 2017 session concluded at approximately 1800.

November 17, 2017 Session

The Commission resumed its meeting at approximately 0900 on November 17, 2017.

Meeting with GAO

Chairman Heck briefed the Commission on the meeting with GAO, which occurred earlier in the morning. In addition to the Chairman, Vice Chair Gearan and Vice Chair Wada attended the meeting.

Chairman Heck informed Commissioners that GAO had completed its report and submitted it to DoD for comment. GAO would submit its report to Congress on December 1, and release the

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

final version in the middle of January. GAO indicated that it did not intend to include anything provided by the Commission in its report but did believe it was helpful to get the Commission's opinion on the underlying report by DoD.

GAO explained to the Chairman and Vice Chairs that they thought the DoD met the statutory requirements but lacked detail. GAO noted in particular the lack of detail on future needs.

GAO mentioned a report it had prepared in 2012 about the Selective Service System. Chairman Heck requested the staff to circulate this report to Commissioners.

GAO offered continued assistance to the Commission going forward. GAO asked whether the Commission's appropriation would suffice. Chairman Heck informed GAO that while the Commission is just getting started, it would appreciate GAO looking at the appropriation vis-à-vis the amount appropriated for the Military Compensation and Retirement Modernization Commission (MCRMC), which received a supplemental appropriation and also had back-office support provided by DoD.

Meeting with Researchers at Kennedy School of Government

On November 1, 2017, Vice Chair Gearan met with MG (Ret) William E. Rapp, Faculty Chair of the National Security Fellows program at the Kennedy School of Government's Belfer Center, and three National Security Fellows – COL Tom Sarrouf, U.S. Army National Guard; LTC (P) Jason Edwards, U.S. Army; and Lt Col Ernesto DiVittorio, U.S. Air Force. Vice Chair Gearan informed the Commission that the Fellows had chosen to examine methods to incentivize military, national, and public service as their research project for the year.

Vice Chair Gearan suggested that the Fellows' research could prove helpful to the Commission, and recommended that Dr. Rough be put in touch with the Fellows and determine how best to utilize the products of their research.

Engagement with Outside Researchers

Commissioners, recognizing the likelihood of multiple offers to support the Commission's work, deliberated the approaches for dealing with such offers.

Mr. Gearan described a conversation with Ash Carter in which they discussed thinking outside the box to bring in the right skill sets for different projects. That may entail employees, detailees from other agencies, and volunteers – people who want to help.

Ms. Davidson described the different types of people who could support the Commission's research objectives. These include people who want jobs; people who want to help; and people who want to be asked for advice. Ms. Davidson suggested holding a conference for people in the third category, and reaching out to several groups of people in the second category – creating something of a competitive analytical effort.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

In terms of specific outside sources, Mr. Khazei suggested contacting Bob Gates, now Chancellor at William & Mary and former Secretary of Defense, and also the Panetta Institute. Ms. Davidson suggested contacting CNAS through Michelle Flournoy.

Meeting with Senior Executives Association

Ms. Skelly briefed the Commission on a meeting she had recently with Bill Valdez, the President of the Senior Executives Association (SEA), and the SEA Executive Director. According to Ms. Skelly, SEA has a number of ideas to assist the Commission in its work, including ideas about connecting the Commission with other groups focused on national service. SEA also recently launched a program called Communities of Change that has relevance to the Commission's mandate. (According to the SEA website, "Communities of Change were created to utilize the expertise and experience of SEA members to address important issues affecting government leaders and produce legislative/policy solutions that result in a more effective and efficient government that is responsive to the exponential changes facing society at large.") Ms. Skelly informed SEA that the Commission will reach back to SEA as work progresses.

Meeting with Obama Administration Alumni Group

Ms. Skelly reported on a recent meeting with an Obama administration alumni group. She reported significant interest among those attending in the work of the Commission.

Outreach

The Commission held a discussion about outreach strategy.

Ms. Lowry began by identifying three buckets for outreach: government, including Congress, the Executive Branch, and state and local officials; non-governmental organizations, including academia, think tanks, the private sector, and non-profits; and the media.

Ms. Davidson further developed this outreach concept. She suggested the Commission make use of different groups to pursue research, once the questions are identified. Those groups include Commission employees; volunteers at academic institutions and think tanks; and experts. She suggested the Commission issue research project requests and leverage the community of experts at think tanks and academia through conferences. Ms. Davidson offered to contact Michelle Flournoy about CNAS hosting a panel on service at its annual conference in June. Ms. Davidson also suggested developing a list of individuals who have expertise in the different areas covered by the Commission's mandate.

Vice Chair Gearan suggested the Commission may find it useful to work backward from report completion to identify those individuals and groups the Commission would not want to omit from its engagement efforts.

Ms. Davidson suggested that the Commission's engagement effort be structured to generate a conversation across the country.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Mr. Khazei suggested the Commission identify events, such as conferences, that are or will be occurring and request time for the Commission to speak or for panels to be included to address issues in the Commission's mandate.

Ms. Davidson suggested that the Commission host an all-day conference or work with another organization to co-host such an event.

Chairman Heck agreed with others that these sorts of events would present great opportunities to answer the Commission's questions, noting the importance of identifying what those questions are. Given the large numbers of groups with likely interest in contributing, everything the Commission does must be geared to answer those questions.

Ms. Davidson noted that in the early stage, the Commission may not know what those questions are. She suggested the Commission conduct surveys, research, a listening tour, and face-to-face outreach to help define the questions.

Ms. Lowry asked whether the website and social media could be used to solicit information. Dr. Rough mentioned that this had come up in connection with the rollout discussion the previous day. Mr. Lekas then addressed legal issues related to information collection activities. Ms. Davidson wondered if some of the legal issues would be allayed were a third party partner to conduct a survey. Mr. Lekas agreed to examine this issue and report back to the Commission.

Mr. Abernathy stressed the importance of engaging as many people as possible and engaging with the right people. He noted that with Dr. Rough and Ms. Lowry on board, the staff could move ahead with this line of effort.

Ms. Skelly emphasized the importance of determining the "why" for each form of engagement contemplated during each phase of the Commission's work.

Dr. Rough shared her preliminary thoughts on data collection. She distinguished between the selective service question and the military, national, and public service-related questions. The selective service piece is more inward facing: it requires identifying what the country needs, what the national security needs are, rather than asking the public what it needs. The service pieces, including how to increase the propensity to service, will require gathering information from people around the country in part through a survey.

Ms. Davidson shared further thoughts about how the staff should go about examining the selective service piece. Staff should begin by looking at existing research into topics such as the purpose of the draft; the broader context of civilian-military relations; civilian control of the military; and the changing nature of war. Staff should then brief the Commission on the literature review, the theoretical foundation of each of these topics, and how each has developed over the past few decades – including, for example, how the percentages of Americans who serve in the military and whose families have served have changed over time. Ms. Davidson offered to provide the staff with a reading list to guide the first phase of this work.

Rollout Plan – Continued

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

The Commission revisited its discussion about the January rollout plan.

Chairman Heck reviewed the preliminary conclusions reached during deliberations the prior day. Although the original plan targeted February for a rollout, as the Chairman explained, the National Day of Service in January, which would occur three days before the Commission's scheduled January meeting, made it advisable to hold the rollout event on January 18, 2018. This would enable the Commission to tap into the overall narrative of service.

Chairman Heck indicated that by the rollout event, the Commission should have in place a calendar of events through June 2018. Those events would include small public meetings in February, based on the location of Commissioners. Each event would need to have a discrete purpose to be informed by Dr. Rough's research objectives and to occur in locations based on Ms. Lowry's outreach objectives. The February meetings would be followed by further, potentially larger meetings, such as one at a military installation and one at an academic institution between March and June. The Commission would continue to target late fall of 2018 for issuance of an interim report. While the contents of the report would be determined at a later date, one suggestion is for the report to provide historical background and context and then a first draft of the Commission's proposed recommendations to serve as fodder for hearings and public input on recommendations that would occur in 2019.

During the course of deliberations, Commissioners made a number of observations regarding the form, substance, and objectives of the rollout event. The following records some of the more salient observations made during the deliberation and is meant to supplement points raised during the November 16 discussion (*see supra*).

- Mr. Gearan recommended that the Commission secure support from key opinion press and earned media ahead of the rollout event. Given media focus on the National Day of Service, it would be advisable to have notable columnists, for example Thomas Friedman of the New York Times, write about the Commission during the weekend prior to the rollout event.
- Commissioners deliberated whether to engage in a service activity in connection with the rollout event. Mr. Khazei suggested, and others agreed, that Commissioners engage in service activities in their own communities on the National Day of Service and be prepared to discuss their experiences, as warranted, during the public meeting.
- Several Commissioners highlighted the need for star power at the event and the need to lock down guests as soon as possible.
- Commissioners discussed additional potential locations for the meeting, including the Hall of States, and a TBD service site.
- Additional suggestions for guest speakers included a celebrity, such as Tom Hanks or Gary Sinese; a former Peace Corps director; a former Secretary of State; a former governor; people who have participated in PeaceCorps, AmeriCorps, and the military; an ambassador; Chelsea Clinton and Barbara Bush; and the head of Team Rubicon.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

- Commissioners resolved to reach out to members of Congress and certain other notable individuals to assess availability.
- Regarding the follow-on public meeting, Commissioners suggested an approach involving two panels, one with known figures and the other with people who served.

The Chairman tasked Dr. Rough and Ms. Lowry with assessing the Commission's research and outreach needs to develop the agenda and cast for the rollout event and the follow-on public meeting. Dr. Rough and Ms. Lowry should report back to the Commission at the December 2017 meeting.

Thoughts on Service by Robert Schraven

Robert Schraven, CEO of Vertige Consulting, LLC, briefed the Commission on his personal experience in service.

Mr. Schraven explained that he was motivated to join the military because of his interest in WWII history and because of team sports. *Top Gun* inspired him to join the Navy in particular. Mr. Schraven described a childhood in which his father instilled the importance of giving time to help others. Mr. Schraven noted that he did not have any real civics education, and it was really his father who instilled the ethos to serve in him.

Mr. Schraven provided his views on how to reach millennials. He said it is necessary to use technology, and to engage and survey them. His view is that millennials want to help but do not always know how they can. This suggests part of the effort needs to focus on awareness, on informing them what they can do. Another part is to find out directly from them what matters and how they would want to contribute. Mr. Schraven thought it important that millennials have skin in the game. That could be achieved by a mandatory service requirement. Doing that would also help to identify people with critical needs. Mr. Schraven does support a mandatory two-year service requirement. He does not have thoughts on how to inspire service for its own good other than appealing to the selfish side of millennials such as providing college credit or tuition assistance.

Mr. Schraven works with young vets. Among them, he has seen a stronger sense of family, a stronger bond than older vets. He attributes this to the increase in low intensity conflict; the nature of the all-volunteer force; and the length of the war. He finds young vets more willing to engage and help each other. He sees senior enlisted folks (E8, E9) serving as great mentors to the younger ones.

Mr. Schraven believes it is also important to provide service opportunities to those who have been passed over for other opportunities. That is something those people will never forget, and they will give back.

Mr. Schraven did not have thoughts about how to engage corporations to require service or place a stronger emphasis on service. His company has begun requiring a day of volunteering by every employee. He does not know how to encourage other companies to follow suit.

**ATTORNEY-CLIENT COMMUNICATION
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL
FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY – NOT FOR RELEASE**

Executive Session

At approximately 1220, Commissioners convened an executive session outside the presence of staff. The executive session concluded at approximately 1320.

Prepared by Paul Lekas, General Counsel

Adopted by the Commission on December 14, 2017