A Message from the Community Leader

Welcome to the Fall 2012 edition of the Security and Emergency Services Community of Interest newsletter.

As you can imagine, all areas of the Department of Defense continue to be scrutinized for cost efficiencies. This, of course, includes the Marine Corps’ civilian workforce. Recently, the Department of the Navy was asked by the Secretary of Defense to examine its civilian workforce and report back on the impacts of a 3%, 5%, and 7% reduction to the workforce. The Security and Emergency Services Community of Interest worked closely with Manpower and Reserve Affairs in providing input to the response. The Under Secretary of the Navy responded to the Secretary of Defense late last month.

In his reply, Mr. Work stated that anything above a 2.5% reduction to the Department’s civilian workforce would “make it much more difficult for the Department of the Navy to accomplish its mission.” The Under Secretary’s response made it clear that the highest levels of the Department’s leadership understand the critical importance of our civilian workforce.

MARADMIN 640-12 (Security and Emergency Services and Jim Kallstrom Annual Awards) has recently been published. I urge all civilian and military leaders to submit nominations for deserving individuals. Award submissions must reach HQMC NLT 25 Jan 13. The MARADMIN and the submission template can be found on the Security and Emergency Service’s SharePoint site.

Finally, the dates for the 2013 Senior Leaders’ Security Conference have been established – the conference will be held aboard MCRD San Diego 5 to 7 March 13. Initial details are contained in CMC 191622Z Oct 12.

Semper fidelis,
Raymond F. Geoffroy
Assistant Deputy Commandant (Security)
Plans, Policies, and Operations

2013 Senior Leadership Security Conference

by Mr. Bill Gresham, HQMC, PP&O(PSM)

The Deputy Commandant, Plans, Policies and Operations (Security), will be hosting the annual Marine Corps Senior Leaders Security Conference 5-7 March, 2013 at the MCRD, San Diego Conference Center. Travel dates for the conference are 4 and 8 March 2013.

The intent of this conference will be to focus on issues and topics that require senior leader collaboration and input, and to discuss pertinent issues and network with leadership at the Colonel/GS-15/Program Manager/Provost Marshal/Police Chief level from the following communities: Marine Corps Law Enforcement; Mission Assurance; Physical Security and Information and Personnel Security programs; Defense Support of Civil Authorities (DSCA); and the Security and Emergency Services Community of Interest in one forum, to develop strategic guidance for synchronization of policy and program areas within the security division.

This year’s Security Conference will also include a meeting of the Protection Advocate Executive Steering Group (ESG). The ESG will convene on the first day of the conference to review the efforts of the Mission Assurance Operational Advisory Group (MA OAG), and to make specific recommendations to DC, PP&O as the Protection Advocate regarding the prioritization of the Advocate’s Capabilities List (ACL) and Advocate’s Gap List (AGL). These documents will subsequently be used to inform POM-16 deliberations in the new Marine Corps Force Development Process.

Forthcoming message #2 will provide all necessary information for applicable attendees. Message #1 was sent, CMC 191622Z Oct 12.
From the Editor
by Mr. Pete Loughlin, HQMC PP&O(PS)

As you can see by the number of excellent articles in this edition, things are moving very quickly in the Security and Emergency Services arena. I’d like to add a couple of more.

Recently, Manpower and Reserve Affairs sent the Marine Corps Regional Human Resources Offices the following – “OPM released for implementation the final Position Classification Flysheet for the Emergency Management Series, 0089. This series covers emergency management work including managing, and coordinating with other entities, the prevention of, protection from, preparedness for, response to, recovery from and/or mitigation of intentional and/or unintentional crises, disasters, other humanitarian emergencies, hazards, or natural and man-made/technological (chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, high-yield explosives) incidents. Please review any positions that perform these functions for possible conversion.” If you are performing the duties of an Emergency Manager under a different Occupational Series and have not yet been contacted by your local HR Office about reclassifying your position, I highly recommend that you contact them to initiate this action.

Second, one of the most diverse occupational series in the community is the 0080/86 population. We recently polled all of them and essentially asked them to identify their primary duty from the following list:

- ATFP
- CBRNE
- CIP
- EKMS
- Emergency Management
- Info/Personnel Security
- Loss Prevention (MCCS/NAF billets)
- Mission Assurance
- Police Services
- Physical Security
- Special Access Programs
- Special Security Officer
- Other

While the traditional “Information/Personnel Security” duties are still the most common, fully two thirds of the 0080/86 population is now performing other duties. Below is a breakout of the 356 0080/86 positions throughout the Marine Corps.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of 0080/86 Disciplines]

- ATFP (5.06%)
- CBRNE (3.65%)
- CIP (1.4%)
- EKMS (3.65%)
- EM (0.56%)
- IPSP (32.58%)
- Loss Prevention (6.18%)
- Mission Assurance (5.34%)
- Police Services (18.82%)
- Physical Security (11.24%)
- SAP (3.09%)
- SSO (4.49%)
- OTHER (3.93%)
MCB QUANTICO, VA. -- Driving home from his shift on May 25, 2012, while stopped at a red light about three minutes from his house, Cpl. Michael Rivera, a civilian police officer at the Provost Marshal’s office, watched a white Jeep Cherokee smash into the back of a small pickup truck that was waiting at the light adjacent to him.

“It was a nasty hit,” said Rivera. “It was one of those sounds that just makes you cringe. I’m a combat veteran and, if you’re used to that noise, it snaps you to react.”

React is just what Rivera did, who moved his car to the edge of the road and ran over to the woman in the Cherokee. By the time he reached her, the car was on fire.

“I had to react,” said Rivera, a Marine who served in Operation Enduring Freedom in 2009 as a gunnery sergeant. “That’s what every Marine does. They teach you how to react, you just don’t stand there.”

But this wasn’t the first time Rivera had to react to a dire situation. While serving in Helmand Province, Afghanistan he saw a spurt of sand and dirt from a few feet away where Lance Cpl. Justin Swanson was driving his humvee when an improvised explosive device went off. Rivera limped to the humvee on a leg fractured by the explosion. Swanson was killed and two other Marines injured in the incident. In November Rivera was awarded the Purple Heart for his actions.

This time Rivera found an elderly woman with no seat belt on, slumped over in the burning Cherokee, and the front of the vehicle was smashed up to the front tires. Rivera had no time to check for a pulse or administer first aid; he just had time to remove her from the vehicle before it became fully engulfed in flames.

“By the time I yanked her out and took a couple steps, somebody was grabbing her legs” said Rivera. “It was an off-duty nurse who began the initial first aid.”

The first victim was being looked after and away from harm. Rivera looked down the road to see if anyone was helping the second victim and, to his amazement, no one else had gotten out of their car to help.

“No one had responded to him so I tried to head down that way,” said Rivera, “but I had to go around her car that was on fire. By the time I got to it, the fire department had already arrived on scene.”

Spotsylvania’s sheriff’s department intends to recommend Rivera for an award for his actions in saving the elderly woman’s life.


Rainey recalled a conversation he had with the sheriff who was amazed that a guy on his way home, minding his own business, witnessed a car hit another vehicle and he ran to help, not even thinking who it was or why it happened.

“It wasn’t a surprise to hear he was one of the few who got out to help,” said Rainey. “He is a solid police officer who takes his job very seriously and is committed to the ethos of being a police officer.”

Almost three weeks after the accident, Rivera had the chance to meet the victim.

“I met her and her family on Friday,” said Rivera. “I saw her daughter and she thanked me.

“I guess it’s a blessing in disguise, the second day she was at the hospital they found out she had pancreatic cancer, and she thanked me because they found it in the early stages. Otherwise she wouldn’t have known.”
Coordinating Emergency Management Outside the Gate
by Mr. Mark Brown, HQMC, PP&O (PS)

The terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the devastation of Hurricane Katrina alerted the nation to the need for massive changes in how our country prepares for and responds to terrorist attacks and natural disasters. Similarly, the shootings that occurred on Fort Hood, on November 5, 2009 were a wake-up call for the Department of Defense (DoD). Within two weeks, the Secretary of Defense formed an Independent Review (IR) panel, with direction to identify possible deficiencies and make recommendations related to the DoD’s emergency response capabilities.

The report was eye-opening, with a wide-ranging impact. Within nine months of the report’s publication, Change 1 to the newly released DoDI 6055.17 DoD Installation Emergency Management Program was published, incorporating many of the recommendations of the IR panel. The Marine Corps published MCO 3440.9, to implement its Installation Emergency Management (IEM) Program, and began hiring experienced emergency managers for its bases and installations.

Over time, as a result of trends identified by HQMC Mission Assurance Assessment Team (MAAT) site visits, it became clear that many bases need assistance in developing fully coordinated emergency management programs in order to meet the operational capabilities mandated by DoDI 6055.17. To that end, the HQMC Emergency Management Program Assurance Team (EMPAT) was formed in June 2012 to conduct the initial required Capability Assessments. Through site visits, the EMPAT also provides hands-on assistance and ready-to-use templates for Marine Corps bases and installations in their development of IEM Program Implementation Bulletins and All-Hazards Plans.

As a result of its interactions with Installation Emergency Managers, the EMPAT has learned how these talented professionals have been able to contribute to the mission effectiveness of their respective bases. Two stories illustrate this point.

**Marine Corps Base (MCB) Camp Lejeune, NC.** In March 2011, a small fire that started on one of the ranges in the Greater Sandy Run Training Area on MCB Camp Lejeune got the better of base firefighters and with the “Perfect Storm” conditions of dry weather, strong winds and high temperatures, quickly spread. Thick smoke from the fire forced the closure of North Carolina Highway 17, a major thoroughfare in the area. Schools and civilian homes were threatened by fire and smoke.

Days later, with the wildfire still burning out of control, Base forestry along with firefighters and equipment from Onslow County were quickly becoming overwhelmed and exhausted. At that point the Installation Emergency Manager, working in concert with Base Forestry recommended requesting assistance from the State of North Carolina. Within hours, a highly experienced Type 2 Incident Management Team (IMT) from the North Carolina Forest Service arrived, bringing much needed expertise in addition to critically needed firefighting resources that made the difference in containing and extinguishing this fire that burned 10,000 acres.

In all the North Carolina Forest Service provided:
- 63 personnel as part of the IMT
- 61 Wildland firefighters
- 7 Tractor/Plow teams
- 1 helicopter
- 6 water-dropping Air Tankers.

The IMT greatly aided in the management of the activities and efforts of not only the Forest Service assets, but also the 109 volunteer firefighters coming from 28 volunteer fire stations, in addition to the Camp Lejeune firefighters. The Installation Emergency Manager’s relationships and connections beyond the MCB Camp Lejeune fence line greatly facilitated taking advantage of resources that might otherwise have gone unused.

Those relationships paid off again, a month later, when a tornado struck the Tarawa Terrace housing area with wind speeds estimated at 125 mph and causing moderate to severe damage to 211 housing units and the elementary school.

**Marine Corps Logistics Base (MCLB) Albany, GA.** The location for MCLB Albany was originally chosen with the idea that it would be sufficiently inland as not to be impacted by the storms that hit coastal areas. Therefore, MCLB Albany can and does serve as a safe-haven for other installations when they are threatened by destructive weather.

In late August, 2012, as Hurricane Isaac approached the Gulf Coast, the decision was made to evacuate close to 4,000 sailors and Marines undergoing training in Pensacola, FL. Late on Sunday evening, a call was made to the Commanding Officer of MCLB Albany requesting assistance and actions were immediately put in motion. A huge warehouse was cleared to allow the placement of cots for the incoming personnel. Arrangements were made for showers and sanitary facilities. The MCLB Marine Corps Community Services (MCCS) swung into action to provide a mobile canteen and other services. Everything was made ready.

The MCLB Installation Emergency Manager assisted in coordinating the contracting for the 80+ buses needed to transport that many people. He also coordinated with the Georgia State Police, letting them know when this massive convoy was on its way and the
routing it would take. Control points were established to ensure that no one got lost along the nearly 300 mile, 5+ hour journey. A couple of days later, after Isaac had blown itself out inland, the reverse journey began and the sailors and Marines were returned to Pensacola.

Once again, connections beyond the base’s gates proved fortuitous in ensuring the safe and effective movement of this large body of people. DoDI 6055.17 states, “All IEM programs coordinate, where appropriate, with State, local, and tribal governments, other Military Department(s), or host-nation emergency response agencies and departments to identify and update responsible points of contact, emergency protocols, and expectations in the event of an emergency on or impacting a DoD installation...” The experiences of these two bases validate that requirement.

Relationships of Installation Emergency Managers with their peers and counterparts in the surrounding communities, counties and states also pay off when it comes time to conduct emergency management training classes for base personnel. Local emergency managers can also prove valuable when conducting exercises to validate all-hazards plans. They are often a great source of experience and expertise. For these reasons, as a part of its ongoing efforts to aid and assist Marine Corps bases and stations, the EMPAT strongly encourages coordination of local Installation Emergency Managers with their counterparts outside the fence line.

---

**Emergency Dispatch Update**

_by Ms. Jennifer Boughton, HQMC, PP&O (PSM)_

Efforts are underway through the Emergency Management Command and Coordination (EMC2) initiative to modernize emergency dispatch operations. In short, EMC2 is working to field integrated systems to receive, process and manage emergency calls for service via wired and wireless telephone calls and radio requests.

Tragic events at Ft. Hood in 2009 highlighted the inability of the military to meet public law requiring 911 call handling. The Secretary of the Navy published policy for emergency call handling for all DoD Installations. As a result, the EMC2 initiative was created by a Marine Requirements Oversight Council (MROC) Decision Memorandum (MROCDM). The MROCDM directed the identification of shortfalls, development of solutions and training requirements to implement corrective measures at all Marine Corps installations by FY2016. Working through various Integrated Product Teams of operational, technical and functional experts, engineers, system architects and other specialized personnel, HQMC PP&O determined the system requirements and partnered with Marine Corps System Command (MCSC) to deliver upgrades to existing systems.

Significant study, analysis and documentation have been completed to comply with mandated acquisition processes. Many of you may have been involved in responding to surveys for the status of current dispatch operations, radio and telephone technology and training. In the current fiscally constrained environment, risk-based decisions have been made to determine “best value” requirements with costs developed and approved to fund this initiative. While the resulting requirements are better than what is currently in place throughout the Marine Corps, significant care was taken to avoid chasing technology and falsely inflating the requirements. The intent is to field systems that are authorized to operate on designated networks while standardizing capabilities, maintenance and sustainment through smart investments.

The new attention to trained dispatchers mandated by the Secretary of the Navy requires the Marine Corps to examine standards, methods and qualifications for dispatchers. A Dispatch Training Strategy was developed and aligned to the dispatcher Community of Interest Career Roadmap. A follow on needs assessment identified the training gaps at CONUS installations. This needs assessment can be used to effectively expend installation training funds.

MROCDM (45-2012) approved the requirements for dispatch centers, and union negotiations resulted in a Memorandum of Understanding between HQMC and bargaining unit employees. Successful labor relations resulted in the publication of MarAdmin 469/12 which announced the implementation of the EMC2 Program and provided interim guidance for installations. Fielding to each installation will require continued coordination. Currently, the EMC2 Oversight Council (a one-star level decision-making body mandated to oversee EMC2 in an earlier MROCDM) is considering a change to fielding priority. This change is due to significant information gained in the analysis stages of the effort and aligns implementation with technology failures.

With the establishment of Marine Corps Installation Command (MCICOM), execution of the program management will shift from PP&O to MCICOM. MCICOM, through their G3/5/7, will assist installations in preparing for fielding, execution of standards and training. PP&O (PS) will continue to develop policy and doctrine supporting the EMC2 initiative. Current efforts include the development of scenario based Concept of Operations, literature review of policies requiring update or development and development of metrics and measures associated with Program Management.

PP&O (PS) points of contact are Mr. Paul Ljuba or Ms. Jennifer Boughton. MCICOM point of contact is Mr. Tom Ruffini. Personnel who desire to view various acquisition and programmatic documentation can request MCSC Sharepoint access through Ms. Boughton. Limited documentation is available at the PSM Sharepoint site [https://ehqmc.usmc.mil/org/ppo/PS/PSM/](https://ehqmc.usmc.mil/org/ppo/PS/PSM/) under the Mission Assurance OAG document library.
Marine Corps’ Mission Assurance Assessment Program (MCMAAP)

by Mr. Doug Phelps, HQMC, PP&O (PSM)

The Mission Assurance Assessment program provides commanders with a Mission Assurance/All Hazards Risk Assessment and Inspection Program that integrates all aspects of Mission Assurance; provides Commanders with useful results to support an integrated, risk management, decision process; and “quantifies” missions against risks in order to best allocate scarce protection resources and provide the commander with useful results to support an integrated risk management decision process.

From July 2010 to present, the establishment of the Mission Assurance Assessment Team (MAAT), with its attendant methodologies and benchmarks, has allowed the Marine Corps to develop a standardized process to assess protection related programs policy requirements. And since that time, when the MAAT completed the first MAA pilot, 22 MAAs have been conducted. By the end of FY13, all bases and installations will have had a MAA.

The MCMAAP’s success is attributable to the direct interaction of the various Mission Assurance Program Managers (PMs), to include AT, CIP, PS, CBRNE, LE, and IEM, providing SMEs as assessment team members. Having each of these assessors work directly in support of these programs has allowed a conduit for the PMs to address immediate solutions to issues that arise during MAAs. This connection also provides the PMs a level of situational awareness that they may not have been privy to in the past. This awareness allows PMs the ability to prioritize their programs efforts, in order to better support the immediate needs of the warfighter.

During the course of MAAs and in an effort to continuously evolve and improve, the MAAT has improved many of its processes based on the direct feedback and recommendations provided from the MA community. As these changes were incorporated, it has become quite evident that the direct linkages to programs have truly provided each PM an equal voice at the table, allowing them to synchronize their programs’ efforts and in turn, this effort continues to support the Mission Assurance Programs goals to reduce redundancies, standardize risk management and reduce risk to the warfighters’ missions.

In the ongoing effort to continue this synchronization and collaboration, the MAAT has taken the lead role in providing other protection related programs a channel to ensure their programs’ requirements are ingrained into the Mission Assurance Programs efforts. This “open door” initiative has been successful. For example, it has provided programs the ability to expand their efforts in the identification of gaps in the programs capabilities. This allows these PM’s the ability to collect validated data that can support their programs future funding initiatives within the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) process and develop cost effective enterprise solutions to reduce risk within their programs.

The following additions have been incorporated into the MAAT’s processes:

**Law Enforcement Accreditation:** Over the past year Mr. Shane Groah has led the Installation Law Enforcement community in the development of the Marine Corps Law Enforcement Accreditation Program (MCLEAP). This program provides commanders with a quantifiable measure of performance for their installation’s Provost Marshal Office (PMO) or Marine Corps Police Department (MCPD) based on requirements identified in DoD, DoN and USMC directives. Once performance is measured the accreditation team uses the data to create a tailored plan of corrective action, or remediation strategy, designed to improve performance across 16 law enforcement functional areas. To improve opportunities for success and to maintain performance improvement momentum, the accreditation team partners with the PMO/MCPD throughout the remediation process. The accreditation assessment occurs in concert with the MAA. The MAAT LE assessor works closely with the LE Accreditation team to reduce assessment redundancy and operational impact to the installation.

**Cyber Integration:** During the first year of implementation of MAAs, MARFORCYBER and C4 were tasked by the ACMC to identify control system assets that could be exploited due to cyber threats. In an effort to support this task, the MAAT in coordination with these commands developed cyber control system benchmarks based on current DoD policy. As the benchmarks were ingrained in the MAAs, the team has made great strides identifying, and remediating numerous concerns related to protecting control system assets that could cause mission failure or degradation. To support this effort, MARFORCYBER and C4 provided SMEs to support the MAAT and has established a process to assist the installations in follow up on efforts to reduce risk to these assets after the MAAs.

**MCICOM (G-6):** During the past year, while MCICOM was moving toward full operational capability (FOC), the MCICOM G-6 has provided direct support to the MAAT in respect to assessment process of communications infrastructure. This support has greatly benefited the MAAT’s ability to assist and support the installations communication needs prior to, during, and after these assessments. In addition to this support, MCICOM in coordination with C4, MARFORCYBER, and PP&O PS, was able to host an installation specific cyber control system training course. This course, conducted during September 2012, brought in key members of the installations support staffs (S-6, Facilities, and Mission Assurance personnel) to teach the importance for cyber control system security, and key ways to protect their specific control systems.

**CBRNE-Program Assurance Team (C-PAT):** During the past two years the C-PAT has provided support to the installation in conducting a quality control assessment of CBRNE equipment, and direct assistance to ensure the installations can maintain a high state of readiness for its equipment and training. A majority of the team’s effort is conducted prior to the assessment, identifying
shortfalls and providing analysis prior to the actual assessment. The C-PAT’s effort is directly aligned to the MAAT CBRNE assessor process, providing in depth analysis of risk to the installations CBRNE equipment and its associated supply maintenance management program.

Emergency Management-Program Assurance Team (EM-PAT): During the past year, Mr. Mark Brown (IEM PM) has begun efforts to establish an EM-PAT that can support the installations efforts to meet the current Installation Emergency Management (IEM) implementation guidance outlined in DoD Policy. To ensure synchronization of these teams efforts, this team was established to work in coordination with the MAAT much like the C-PAT. The only difference is this team will conduct its support efforts during the Pre Assessment Mission Analysis portion of the assessment. In the near future their efforts will assist the installations efforts to meet the IEM FOC requirements and an integrated effort to ingrain these requirements into the installation’s current all hazard plans. Currently the EM-PAT has conducted two pilots in order to establish a detailed process for assisting the installations and is currently in the process of aligning their schedule to the MAAT schedule for CY 13.

Fire Accreditation and MAA integration: Over the last four months, the MAAT has been coordinating with the Fire & Emergency Services Program Manager from DC I&L to synchronize the existing F&ES Program Management Assessment schedule to align with the MAA, and to build out F&ES specific benchmarks. Although this effort is in the early coordination stages, once synchronized, this coordinated assessment will lessen the overall impact to the installations assessment requirements and ensure that both the Fire and MAA programs requirements are being met.

Personnel Security: In coordination with the Marine Corps Information and Personnel Security Program Manager, Mr. Chip Potts, the MAAT has integrated installation level benchmarks that support requirements for the installation personnel security program. This integration has enhanced the ability of the IPSP to directly assist the Installation Security Manager and their ability to meet all programmatic requirements.

In addition to these program integration and support efforts, the MAAT developed an “All Hazards Threat Assessment” (AHTA) that supports the Marine Corps Mission Assurance Risk Management Methodology. The MAAT outlined the specific requirements based on the requirements in DoDI 2000.16, DODI 3020.40, and DoDI 6055.17 to establish a detailed methodology and a standardized process to create AHTAs for each installation, prior to receiving a MAA.

To ensure this assessment has validity, the team combined localized threat and hazard data with authoritative data sources to establish a standardized methodology that could be reproduced at each installation in the future. The key to the assessments success is the AHTA only outlines the likelihood/probability for each of these threats and hazards, thus allowing the MAAT to produce a threat/hazard score that aligns to the Mission Assurance Risk Management process.

To ensure these assessments are not created in a vacuum, the MAAT carves out time during the Pre-Assessment Mission Analysis visit to review each threat and hazard with the installation Mission Assurance professionals. This ensures the Installation personnel have an opportunity to provide critical feedback prior to the MAAT finalizing the AHTA. Once finalized, the installation receives the final AHTA as an enclosure to the MAA report.

During December 2012, the Joint Staff asked the Marine Corps to provide them a brief on our current MA programs and MAAT’s processes and methodologies. During this brief, the JS J-34 requested that the Marine Corps provide support in the establishment of a Joint Mission Assurance Assessment Pilot (JMAAP). The JMAAP will be conducted in March 2013. Additionally, the MAAT’s methodologies and benchmarks were provided to set a foundation for their upcoming JMAAP. In direct support of this JMAAP, the Marine Corps has and will continue to provide MAAT personnel to support JS working groups in the continued development and refinement of the JMAAP benchmarks and methodologies to ensure the success of the JMAAP’s effort.

In May 2012, The Office of the Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas’ Security Affairs (OASD HD&ASA) published DoD’s new Mission Assurance Strategy, which highlighted the Marine Corps’ MA program as a model within DoD. In conjunction with this strategy, the Marine Corps is in the process of drafting and publishing a Marine Corps Order for the Mission Assurance Program. This order will establish the overall MA program requirements; synchronize redundant requirements; and provide standardized risk management and risk reduction processes to best protect our warfighters’ missions.

As the Marine Corps continues to support and align to the DoD Mission Assurance Strategy, PP&O PS will be sending out an O-6 level review chop of the Marine Corps Order for Mission Assurance. So please take the time to review the draft MA MCO and provide us your thoughts on how we can better support you, the end user in supporting the warfighters’ ability to accomplish their missions.

As we continue to evolve the Mission Assurance Program, your feedback is crucial to mission success.

We realize that just as the threats can change every day, so do the priorities and methodologies needed ensure our warfighters’ mission success. Please know your ideas and suggestions are critical to the success of the Marine Corps Mission Assurance Program.
Message Board

This section is designed to list messages of interest to the S/ES COI. All messages can be found on the S/ES SharePoint site at:


If you don’t have an ehqmc account, you can establish one by contacting Mr. Billy Goard, the site’s administrator, at billy.goard.ctr@usmc.mil.

Important Messages

- MarAdmin 640-12 – CY 2012 Jim Kallstrom and Emergency Services Civilian Awards
- MARADMIN 597/12 – MCICOM and TECOM Responsibilities in the USNORTHCOM and USPACOM Areas of Responsibility for USMC ATFP Responsibilities

CY 13 Mission Assurance Assessment Schedule

28 Jan-2 Feb: MCB Quantico
2-7 Feb: MCAF Quantico
15-19 April: MCAS Iwakuni
13-17 May: MCAS Cherry Point
15-19 July: MCAS Yuma
19-23 Aug: MCRD San Diego
26 Sept-4 Oct: MCB Hawaii
28 Oct-8 Nov: MCB Camp Butler