

The Structure and Function of Public-Private Partnerships for Homeland Security

Jeremy G. Carter, Ph.D.
School of Public and Environmental Affairs
Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis

Abstract:

In an effort to most effectively protect the United States from “all threats and all hazards”, an enormous amount of initiatives and attention have been directed at the development of public-private partnerships between law enforcement, the Intelligence Community and the private sector. However, little attention has been given to how these partnerships should be structured and how they will function – both formally and informally. Success of these partnerships depends upon the members’ abilities to recognize the context and intended outcomes of the partnerships. Identifying issues involved with effective public-private partnerships provides insight for practitioners and researchers alike. The demand, structure and functionality for these partnerships for development and sustainment will be discussed.

Keywords: Public-private partnerships, Law enforcement intelligence, Information sharing, Emergency preparedness

Citation:

Carter, J. G. (2008). The structure and function of public-private partnerships for homeland security. *Homeland Security Review*, 2(3), 235-251.

Introduction

There is currently an emphasis on, and a demand for, the Intelligence Community and state, local, and tribal law enforcement to develop and maintain public-private partnerships (PPPs) with the private sector. The purposes of these partnerships is two-fold; 1) Enhance information sharing to prevent or mitigate threats, and 2) Enhance emergency preparedness and response efforts to “all threats and all hazards”¹. However, in light of current demands, little – if any – attention has been given to the subtleties of these partnerships. A misunderstanding of partnership expectations coupled with poor structures for cooperation creates barriers to success from the beginning of these partnerships, thus predisposing them to ineffectiveness and failure. The intent of this article is to provide both pragmatic insights for those practitioners tasked with the responsibility of creating and maintaining PPPs as well as research insights for academics interested in examining factors related to successful PPPs for homeland security.

Demand for Public-Private Partnerships

A variety of government reports and initiatives – many with implications for policies and standards - identify the need to develop effective PPPs for homeland security and law enforcement. In 2002, President George W. Bush released the *National Strategy for Homeland Security* that operationalized homeland security and the means by which it would be achieved. Paramount to this end was the acknowledgement of non-government organizations – specifically the private sector – and the vital role they play in achieving a “secure homeland” (Office of Homeland Security, 2002). A year later, President Bush reinforced this need when he signed *Presidential Homeland Security Directive-8* that outlined a variety of security facets in which public and private sector organizations needed to cooperate and establish policies to strengthen

the preparedness of the United States to prevent and respond to threatened or actual domestic terrorist attacks, major disasters, and other emergencies (White House, 2003). Soon after, the *9/11 Commission Report* was released identifying the failure of public and private sector entities to effectively cooperate with one another in light of the attacks of September 11th, 2001. In response to these shortcomings, the United States Department of Justice released the *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan* (NCISP) which posits federal, state, local and tribal law enforcement agencies must recognize and partner with the private sector in order to detect and prevent attacks to the nation's critical infrastructure and key resources and that steps should be taken to establish regular communications and methods of information exchange (United States Department of Justice [USDOJ], 2003).

Similarly, the Bureau of Justice Assistance acknowledged in a report, *Engaging the Private Sector to Promote Homeland Security: Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships*, that to effectively protect the nation's critical infrastructure, law enforcement and private security must work collaboratively because neither have the resources to do so alone (Bureau of Justice Assistance [BJA], 2005). The creation of state and regional fusion centersⁱⁱ is further driving the public-private partnership initiative. The *Fusion Center Guidelines*, published by the Department of Justice, express cooperation with the private sector as being an "ultimate goal" (USDOJ, 2004). Moreover, the *Program Manager-Information Sharing Environment* explains that private sector information represents a crucial element in both understanding the current threat environment and protecting our nation's critical infrastructure from targeted attacks. Protecting the nation's infrastructure also requires a robust public-private partnership that provides the private sector with information on incidents, threats, and vulnerabilities, as well as protects proprietary information.

Origins of Public-Private Partnerships

The present emergence and demand for public-private partnerships within homeland security and law enforcement is not a new concept, nor is it unique to criminal justice. Public-private partnerships can be defined as arrangements between government and private sector entities for the purpose of providing public infrastructure, community facilities and related services. Such partnerships are characterized by the sharing of investment, risk, responsibility and reward between the partners (Schaeffer and Loveridge, 2002). It is important to note that public agencies that contract with the private sector to fulfill services as well as instances of funding or granting opportunities are not examples of PPPs (Peters, 1998; Lawther, 2000; Ingerson, 1999) and can perhaps be classified or studied under the umbrella of different terminology, such as intergovernmental management, intergovernmental relations, or federalism (Wright, 1983).

The concept of U.S. government agencies acting interdependently to provide a more comprehensive service to the public is not a contemporary phenomenon. In an article published in 1887, Woodrow Wilson depicted the importance of such partnerships by emphasizing their interdependent cooperation and mutual helpfulness. However, this approach of intergovernmental cooperation did not involve a private sector component. Though PPPs have been traced in European history to the 16th century (Savitch, 1998) and to the 1880s in the US (Beauregard, 1998), the term and practice of “public-private partnership” for reference in this discussion originated during the Carter administration in an effort to aid the US housing economy. Specifically, the *National Urban Policy of 1978* identified the demand for and benefits of PPPs. As a result of inflating interest rates and limitations imposed on taxes, US

cities were beginning to experience a loss of public services as well as an increase of homelessness and foreclosures within the low-income households (Lyall, 1986). In short, it was determined that public funds invested jointly with private sector support to develop public-private partnerships to increase economic development in which the private sector was thought to have an potential gains. These partnerships were not designed to replace government initiatives, but to supplement them as a tool. The argument was that depleting economic stability in large US cities would hinder all aspects of both public and private operations alike – thus the need to cooperate (Lyall, 1986).

The reach of PPPs increased as “new federalismⁱⁱⁱ” arrived along with the Reagan administration. While a decrease in government funding to assist private and non-government organizations began during the Carter administration, the true impact began to come to fruition during Reagan’s tenure. The lack of federal funds to assist a variety of public services resulted in an increased demand for partnerships. The most notable service areas included health, social, housing and community development, employment and training, law enforcement, and income assistance (Musselwhite, 1986; Hudzik, 1987). Despite this economic environment providing the circumstances by which PPPs evolved out of necessity, the lack of government funding to these service areas also weakened existing PPPs (Musselwhite, 1986) – the lack of funding also caused a ripple in the balance of invested resources and risk within the existing PPPs.

The influence of government regulations is perhaps the most salient factor driving the necessity and evolution of PPPs. This is evident across a variety of different arenas. Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) discussed contextual issues that create environmental influences. Most studies in this arena build from numerous other studies related to external environmental influences on organizations (Finstad, 1998). The majority of environmental influence research in

this area focuses on the private sector, such as the competitive health care industry (Meyer *et al.*, 1990), the deregulation of the airline industry (Kelly and Amburgey, 1991) and the savings and loan industry (Haveman, 1992).

Public-Private Partnerships and Criminal Justice

Given the emergence of PPPs across different industries and the gaps they intend to close, it is necessary to discuss the origin of PPPs within the criminal justice arena to provide context for where PPPs have been utilized in criminal justice organizations and where they intend to close gaps within homeland security priorities. The cooperation among public and private sector entities in the criminal justice arena have been in existence since the 1960s when private security and public police began to share similar responsibilities and jurisdictions. Historically, private security and law enforcement agencies have been unable to cooperate effectively (Greene *et al.*, 1995). The *Private Security Advisory Council* identified two main factors which contributed to poor relationships between law enforcement and private security in 1976: 1) incongruence of role expectations, and 2) and two-way stereotyping (May, 1998).

The Hallcrest Report (1985) also examined the relationships between law enforcement and private security. This report acknowledged public law enforcement should, and did, allow private security to operate similar practices to those of law enforcement (NIJ, 1985a). Perhaps more pertinent to the demand for PPPs are the facts illustrated in the second edition of the report where it acknowledged private security employed approximately 1.5 million people operating with an annual budget of \$52 billion. Conversely, federal, state, local and tribal agencies employed approximately 600,000 individuals and operated with a \$30 billion budget (NIJ, 1985b). This report also noted the increased growth of private security and the limited growth of

law enforcement could be attributed to four main factors: 1) increasing workplace crime, 2) increasing fear of crime, 3) a decreasing rate of spending for public protection, and 4) increasing awareness and use of private security effective protective measures (Gunter and Kidwell, 2004).

As noted by Gunter and Kidwell (2004), the focus of public and private sector engagement in the criminal justice arena has shifted from independent action towards mutual cooperation. As an example, in the 1980s, *Operation Cooperation* was established to encourage public-private teamwork. This operation, funded by the U.S. Department of Justice in partnership with the *American Society for Industrial Security* (ASIS), represented a national initiative to encourage partnerships between law enforcement and private security organizations (Connors *et al.*, 2000). Examples of programs established through this initiative are the *Pooling Resources in Defense of our Environment* (PRIDE), *Virginia Police and Private Security Alliance* (VAPPSA), *Dallas/North Texas Regional Law Enforcement and Security Program* (LEAPS), and *Area Police/Private Security Liaison* (APPL) (Connors *et al.*, 2000).

These approaches reflect similar concepts discussed within crime control literature as third-party policing. Third party policing describes police efforts to persuade or coerce third parties, such as landlords, parents, and local business owners, to take some responsibility for preventing crime or reducing crime problems (Mazerolle and Ransley, 2005). The intent of this practice is to create cooperative consultation with community members to help law enforcement facilitate crime prevention and control. Through these cooperative consultations with the community, law enforcement hopes to persuade the third party participant to mitigate the potential for crime to occur in their environment by removing or reducing certain aspects of that environment. For example, in Australia, law enforcement has cooperated with the taxation department investigators to work with companies to reduce tax fraud (Grabosky, 1995).

Public-Private Partnerships to Enhance Emergency Management

Post-9/11, PPPs have been most commonly practiced in the criminal justice arena as a tool to aid in the facilitation of emergency response and preparedness. A lesson learned from the events of 9/11 is the need for cooperation across all levels of public and private sectors to better respond and prepare for emergency situations (i.e. terrorist attacks, biological or chemical attacks, and natural disasters). The Department of Homeland Security acknowledges that the private sector – which operates approximately 85 percent of the US critical infrastructure – is a vital homeland security partner. The private sector offers a variety of information that is imperative to protecting the US from terrorism and other disasters – such as the development of information systems, vaccines, detection devices, and other technologies and innovations that aid to secure the homeland (Department of Homeland Security [DHS], 2002:vii).

In an attempt to meet the demands for PPPs in emergency management, multiple organizations and programs have been developed to aid public and private sector organizations in developing and sustaining these types of relationships. One such group is the Business Executives for National Security (BENS) which is a national, non-partisan organization, that aims to assist senior business executives to help enhance the nation's security (BENS, 2008). In a 2007 report produced by BENS, it was noted that the government alone cannot manage major crises nor effectively integrate the private sector after a crisis occurs and that, with few exceptions, durable, collaborative relationships do not currently exist. An example of a BENS initiative currently in progress is a collaborative effort between Safeguard Iowa and Wal-Mart. In short, Safeguard Iowa – a PPP – and Wal-Mart are attempting to identify logistics to put in place to respond effectively and efficiently to biological or chemical attacks. Since Wal-Mart

currently has the infrastructure in place (i.e. stores, trucks, and personnel) and operates in locations throughout the state of Iowa that all persons have ready access to, they serve as an ideal distributor of vaccines to the public.

A second example of assistance for public and private agencies to build these relationships is the *Critical Incident Protocol-Community Facilitation Program* at Michigan State University^{iv}. This program was developed to facilitate partnerships between the public and private sectors in an attempt to collaborate on how to more effectively and efficiently respond, prepare, and recover from critical incidents (CIP, 2008). This program puts forth a six-step model for successful emergency response PPPs (as taken directly from the program's website):

1. Identify public and private sector stakeholders to co-share leadership
2. Ask leaders to bring others to the table
3. Identify common issues on emergency preparedness for collaboration
4. Identify new resources in the community to mitigate the impact of critical incidents
5. Determine the challenges that participating organizations encounter
6. Create sustainability in the partnership by conducting a needs assessment, setting goals, and scheduling tasks performance

As outlined in these six steps, the focus of the partnership for emergency response is to ensure all members in the community are aware of possible threats and have created an agreed upon a response to those possible threats – both the predictable and unpredictable.

An example of this type of partnership for emergency preparedness is the King County Office of Emergency Management's (KCOEM) *3 Days, 3 Ways, Are You Ready?* which is a preparedness campaign to inform residents how to prepare for disasters. This initiative encourages citizens to prepare a response to a disaster for a minimum of three days in three different ways (Holdeman and Quick, 2006). The KCOEM developed the initiative in 2005 as a tool to motivate individuals to prepare themselves for natural disasters and terrorist attacks. The KCOEM partnered with radio station KOMO, the Seattle Mariners professional baseball team,

the American Red Cross (ARC), and Phillips Medical Systems to promote awareness of the “3 Days, 3 Ways, Are You Ready?” initiative during the Mariners’ baseball season.

The program combines printed advertisements, outreach, and giveaways. The Mariners included a half-page advertisement for the campaign in their information program for season ticket holders at the start of the season. Citizen Corps volunteered personnel to work an information booth about the program at 15 Mariners home games. Furthermore, a disaster kit backpack was given away after the Mariners scored their first two runs during home games. All participating organizations provided financial support for the program. The KCOEM used its *Urban Area Security Initiative* (UASI) funding. KOMO matched every UASI dollar with a donation of \$2.50 in air time. The Seattle Mariners contributed the advertising and booth space while Phillips Medical Systems donated the kits for the giveaway. The ARC donated the backpacks and the program logo design. The KCOEM utilized private partnerships to promote the initiative to the public. This allows King County to spread its message of preparedness to a more broad audience (Holdeman and Quick, 2006).

Structure of Public-Private Partnerships

An aspect of PPPs that deserves discussion is the often over-looked nature of PPPs as having multiple levels of involvement. The concept of a partnership involves an inherent level of commitment on behalf of each member. However, the level of commitment, and therefore benefit of the partnership, varies. Stakeholders’ expectations of outcomes vary in proportion to the investment in the partnership. While PPPs are recommended and desired by public agencies and viewed in positive light by the private sector, they are not required by law to engage with one another. As such, a key component in the equation of successful PPPs is voluntary

commitment. A prerequisite for the development of voluntary cooperative partnerships is that all participants expect to increase positive outcomes as a result of the partnership as compared to the outcomes that would result from a failure to cooperate.

The Committee for Economic Development published a policy book discussing a similar issue. The book noted successful partnership efforts have both a policy dimension and an operational dimension. The policy dimension encompasses a process that produces consensus on community goals, agreement on institutional roles, and sustained support for action (Committee for Economic Development [CED], 1982). The operational dimension consists of three general forms: 1) private initiative for public benefit, 2) government initiative to facilitate or encourage private activity in the public interest, and 3) joint ventures by government and private organizations (CED, 1982). Furthermore, the publication noted a legitimate arena for partnership activities included bolstering key community services which included safety. These fundamental differences in the nature of PPPs and the purposes they are designed to serve will be discussed later on in this paper as they relate to an incongruence of expected outcomes.

Private initiative partnerships for public benefit are instances in which the private sector determines a method or practice that will aid the public sector – typically with respect to operations or management of tasks. The BENS group provides another example of this type of partnership where a private sector company that specializes in information technology and manages logistics for several large US companies offers to provide this service to the Department of Defense. The private company asserts they can provide a more quality service at a quarter of the price (Taibl, 1999) – hence initiating a partnership where the public sector benefits. This type of partnership is at times difficult to delineate from outsourcing. The

distinguishing factor being the advantage provided to the public, not in the form of reduced prices for commercial products.

Government initiative to facilitate or encourage private activity in the public interest encompasses emergency management. These are instances where the government has initiated a collaborative effort between the public and private sectors in the best interest of public safety. Private organizations as a whole do not stand to significantly benefit – if at all – from this form of partnership. They perhaps more appropriately serve as a crutch for the public sector in times of need. There is a lack of constant collaboration as a result of the partnership being based on a “need be” basis. When disasters occur, the private sector comes to aid the public sector’s attempt to respond effectively to the disaster. This form of partnership can possibly be attributed to corporate citizenship – or corporate philanthropy (Porter and Kramer, 2002) – which is the obligation of a private business to operate in the best interest of the community it finds itself. It was normally deemed as something good for the organization to do as long as it benefited stakeholders (McIntosh, 1998).

Joint ventures are partnerships in which all parties stand to benefit from the partnership. This form is most evident with respect to information sharing. While emergency management PPPs are based on “need be” engagement, information sharing PPPs are a constant two-way relationship where each party stands to gain valuable information that directly influences their operations. As such, these partnerships are pursued by both the public and private sector. However it should be noted that only recently have private sector businesses began to illicit the cooperation of federal, state, and local law enforcement to aid the prevention of threats to their company assets and operations.

Each form of these partnerships requires a different level of interdependence among its partners. Gray (1985) refers to interdependencies among stakeholders in the decision to participate in partnerships. Partnerships put participants in more desirable situations if (a) by pooling their resources, they obtain efficiencies; and/or (b) by combining complementary strengths, they can increase the scope of their activities. Coordination of resources and information is necessary for interdependence to be established (Blau and Schoenhern, 1971). Building from March and Simon's (1958) work, Thompson (1967) identified the necessary coordination needed for successful interdependencies in distinctly different natures of partnerships.

Coordination through standardization is necessary in situations where rules and routines constrain the actions of each partner in order to observe consistency (Thompson, 1967). This form of coordination is utilized in instances of pooled interdependence where the agencies involved are asked to provide their own discrete contributions, but do not necessarily have to work directly with one another during the process (O'Toole and Montjoy, 1984). An example of this would be the sharing of information with state or regional fusion centers. Rules and regulations must be observed for accurate and legal information sharing, but partners may provide information to the center in raw form that serves as a contribution, but partners do not deal directly with the fusion center during the process of gathering the information – they simply deliver the information.

Coordination by plan is most beneficial in circumstances where the environment is unstable and dynamic. Sequential interdependence utilizes this form of coordination where the planned actions of partnerships are governed with respect to environmental tasks (Thompson, 1967). This form of interdependence often involves the outcomes of one partner serving as the

inputs of another (O'Toole and Montjoy, 1984). An important note of sequential interdependence is the level of interdependence increases as the dependence on inputs increases. Such as the fusion center example, the fusion center has the highest dependence on the outcomes of the other partners since they are at the end of the outcome chain. If the outcomes of law enforcement agencies and the private sector begin to diminish, so do the inputs, and therefore, outcomes of the fusion center.

Lastly, coordination by mutual adjustment involves the transmission of new information and resources during the process of action (Thompson, 1967) - as situations become more unpredictable, reliance on coordination by mutual adjustment increases (March and Simon, 1958). Mutual adjustment relies on a reciprocal interdependence structure because of the constantly evolving environment requires each partner to require and produce outputs that are simultaneously used as outputs of another partner (O'Toole and Montjoy, 1984). This form of coordination and interdependence applies to the emergency management partnerships. As events unfold and the environment of the partnership – i.e. disasters and emergencies – grows uncertain, partners will rely on one another for emerging information and resources to cope with changing environmental demands.

This section has identified critical organizational, political, and structure components that influence the creation, sustainment, and effectiveness of public-private partnerships. Perhaps most important is the context of the partnership and the nature of the outcomes the partnership is designed to produce. These contrasts have implications for effectiveness that will be discussed in the following section. Table 5 summarizes the types of partnerships, interdependence, and coordination discussed.

Table 5: Structuring of public-private partnerships

	Private Sector Initiative	Government Initiative	Joint Venture Initiative
--	---------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

Type of Interdependence	Pooled	Reciprocal	Sequential
Type of Coordination	Standardization	Mutual adjustment	Standardization / By Plan
Example partnership	Private information management companies providing logistics for the Department of Defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in efficiency and effectiveness • Decrease in cost 	Emergency management plans where public services are aided by private companies <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in efficiency and effectiveness of emergency response delivery • Increased preparedness 	Information sharing partnerships among federal, state, and local law enforcement and the private sector <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both parties gain access to information that was previously unavailable • This information guides operations for a more effective response to threats

Conflicts of Interest: Same Processes, Different Outcomes

The previous section begins to acknowledge a conflict of interest that exists between public sector law enforcement and private sector companies. These conflicts of interest arise out of a contrast in nature between the intent of public sector law enforcement intelligence functions and those of private sector organizations. As such, this conflict serves as the primary barrier to effective PPPs and will be explained in more detail. The intelligence cycle practiced by most public and private sector organizations is similar – collection, evaluation, collation, analysis, reporting, and dissemination (Carter 2004). For purposes of this discussion, each step of this cycle will not be discussed in great detail; however the differences between the approaches taken by the public and private sector will be focused upon – specifically with respect to the intent for outcomes of each intelligence function.

Intelligence functions within state, local and tribal agencies attempt to identify threats to public safety and produce actionable intelligence^v on which operational responses can be based to prevent or mitigate the threat. Raw information is fed into the cycle via suspicious activity reports and overt or covert sources. Information is evaluated for source reliability and information validity. Once information is deemed legitimate, it is collated into appropriate schemas then passed along for analysis in which analysts derive conclusions about the information based upon multiple activity, event, commodity, and link analyses. These analyses provide forecasts and estimates by which reports can be formulated for tactical and strategic responses and thereby disseminated to those who “need to know”. These reports serve as actionable intelligence to drive the operations of law enforcement agencies. The intent of these operations is to prevent harmful threats or hazards from reaching fruition.

Similar, yet different, intelligence functions within private sector organizations attempt to identify threats to personnel, facilities, processes, products and the supply chain that can cause disruption to the enterprise and produce actionable intelligence on which operations can be based to prevent or mitigate the threat. As such, the climate in which information sharing occurs in the private sector should be briefly explained. Information sharing in the private sector can be viewed somewhat as a “quid pro quo” relationship. Currently no rules, regulations, or mandates are in place requiring private organizations to share information with one another – and likely never will exist given proprietary concerns. It is the byproduct of a professional rapport built upon trust and even exchange. Many private organizations are independent of one another – in most cases entirely separate markets - but share common interests with respect to their areas of operation or production – and hence, common interests related to threats.

For example, if a shipping company working in the same port as a commercial cruise line company becomes aware of an event or problems that may affect those who operate in the port, they could provide that information to the cruise line. As a result, the cruise line could plan accordingly with respect to logistics so their business continues to operate as smooth as possible. The quid pro quo relationship for information sharing would involve the cruise line “returning the favor” to the shipping company if they were to become aware of similar information. Ideally, this process would become formalized with liaisons and agreements. These relationships are not confined to organizations that do not compete with one another. In the banking industry, Bank of America and Citibank are competitors who share information to provide assistance to one another. An example of this being extremists who hold protests against companies doing certain types of business. If Bank of America were holding an annual conference and an extremist group showed up to protest, Bank of America would begin to monitor the group’s website (open source intelligence) and while doing so notices the website indicates the group would hold the same type of protest at an upcoming Citibank conference. A member of Bank of America’s assets protection division would call a Citibank to alert them and share some tactics Bank of America has identified to help mitigate the protestors.

Keeping this form of information sharing relationship in context, the intelligence cycle operates in similar fashion, but with different outcomes. Raw information enters the intelligence function through collection, but also delivery – the former represented in the above scenario. Collection efforts are driven by priorities from the organizational hierarchy – i.e. executives wanting information on an area before a large company event or in response to re-occurring problems facing the company. Two examples can provide a more accurate understanding. First, before buying property to build a distribution warehouse in a community, executives want to be

aware of criminal threats in the area that may threaten the warehouse operations and personnel. Second, before entering into an overseas market, executives want to know criminal, health, and safety threats to personnel, facilities, and supply chain before making an investment.

The evaluation process is similar, but perhaps does not play as large of a role in private companies given that information is typically provided by sources already validated (other businesses) and issues regarding adherence to legal protections (e.g. civil rights) and policy do not apply. Collation, analysis, reporting, and dissemination methods are inherently the same as those in law enforcement agencies; however the target of these processes is to produce actionable intelligence for a different purpose. The intent of intelligence functions within private organizations is to provide actionable intelligence to protect company assets through preparing for, and responding to, situations where the company's financial operations are at risk.

Summarizing the two similar, but different, intelligence functions of public and private organizations provides a foundation on which to explain the lack of effectiveness when these two sectors attempt to share information with one another. Public law enforcement agencies work together in a reactive fashion because – to a certain extent – they are being told they have to do so in order to become consistent with national standards. Conversely, private sector companies work together proactively because the parties involved stand to benefit financially from an effective partnership. This is an important aspect to keep in mind when theorizing why these partnerships are not functioning effectively.

Given the nature of public law enforcement information sharing, agencies share information and provide feedback to one another on a “need to know” or “right to know” basis. If a law enforcement agency provides information to another agency because it is requested, it is viewed as a one-way transaction, rarely involving any type of feedback mechanism. The nature

of private sector information sharing is to provide information on a “you might need to know” basis. Given this delivery of information without a request, the feedback of information is more likely to occur – i.e. companies are more likely to reciprocate or provide follow-up information.

A misunderstanding of expectations occurs when public and private organizations share information. Currently, public sector law enforcement agencies tend to request and accept information more readily than they reciprocate whereas private sector companies expect feedback on the information they have provided, but it is rarely received. The lack of feedback on behalf of law enforcement agencies is intermixed with a host of other issues including, but not limited to, private sector personnel receiving classified information, determining the extent to which private companies “need to know” information and the public sector’s ability to protect proprietary information.

Conclusion

For law enforcement, public-private partnerships are critical for preventing and responding to “all hazards”. For the private sector, public-private partnerships are critical for effectively and efficiently protecting company assets and practices. Both sectors stand to either gain or lose effectiveness if the issues discussed in this article are not given adequate attention. Misunderstandings among those involved with respect to expectations can lead to ineffective communication and deteriorated performance of the partnership, thus limiting positive outcomes and wasting resources. The creation of many partnerships as a result of “knee jerk” reactions to the current environmental demands provides opportunities to evaluate what is and is not working. More importantly, consideration needs to be given to the informalities tightly coupled with the creation and sustainment of these partnerships.

References

- Armenakis, Achilles and Bedeian, Arthur. Organizational change: A review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management*, 25(3):293-315.1999.
- Beauregard, R. A. Public-private partnerships as historical chameleons: The case of the United States. In *Partnerships in urban governance: European and American experience*, ed. J. Peierre, 52-70. New York. St. Martins. 1998.
- Blau, Peter Michael and Schoenherr, Richard. *The Structure of Organizations*. New York. Basic Books. 1971.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance. *Engaging the Private Sector to Promote Homeland Security: Law Enforcement-Private Security Partnerships*. Washington, DC: Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice. 2005.
- Business Executives for National Security. www.bens.org. 2008.
- Carter, David Lee. *Law Enforcement Intelligence: A Guide for State, Local and Tribal Law Enforcement Agencies*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. 2004.
- Committee for Economic Development. *Public-private partnership: An opportunity for urban communities: A statement*. Research and Policy. 1982.
- Connors, Edward, Cunningham, William, Ohlhausen, Peter., Oliver, Lynn and Van Meter, Clifford. *Operation Cooperation*. Bureau of Justice Assistance. Washington, D.C. 2000.
- Critical Incident Protocol. Community Facilitation Program. Michigan State University. www.cip.msu.edu. 2008
- Department of Homeland Security. *National Strategy for Homeland Security*. Washington, D.C. White House. 2002.
- Finstad, Nils. The rhetoric of organizational change. *Human Relations*, 51:717-740. 1998.
- Grabosky, Peter. Regulation by reward: On the use of incentives as regulatory instruments. *Laws and Policy*, 17(3):257-282. 1995.
- Gray, Barbara. Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. *Human Relations*, 38(10):911-936. 1985.

- Greene, Jack, Seamon, Thomes and Levy, Paul. Merging public and private security for collective benefit: Philadelphia's center city district. *American Journal of Police*, 4(3):3-20. 1995.
- Gunter, Whitney and Kidwell, Jason. *Law Enforcement and Private Security Liaison: Partnerships for Cooperation*. International Foundation for Protection Officers. York College of Pennsylvania. 2004.
- Haveman, Heather. Between a rock and a hard place: Organizational change and performance under conditions of fundamental environmental transformation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 37(1):48-75. 1992.
- Holdeman, Eric and Quick, Jamie. *Public-Private Partnerships: Promoting King County, Washington's 3 Days, 3 Ways, Are You Ready? Preparedness Program*. King County, Washington Office of Emergency. Lessons Learned Information Sharing. Department of Homeland Security. 2006.
- Hudzik, John. Surviving the loss of federal dollars and mandate: The case of state planning agencies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15(2):105-120. 1987.
- Ingerson, Alice. *Is "public-private partnership" empty rhetoric?* Cambridge, MA. Harvard University, Institute for Cultural Landscape Studies. 1999.
- Kelly, Dawn and Amburgey, Terry). Organizational inertia and momentum: A dynamic model of strategic change. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3):591-612. 1991.
- Lawther, Wendell. *Privatizing toll roads: A public-private partnership*. Westport. CT: Praeger. 2000.
- Lyall, Katharine. Public-private partnerships in the Carter years. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 36(2):4-13. 1986.
- March, James and Simon, Herbert. *Organizations*. John Wiley and Sons. New York. 1958.
- May, Johnny. Police and security liaison. In *IFPO, Protection officer training manual*, 269-273. Boston: Butterworth-Heinemann. 1998.
- Mazerolle, Lorraine and Ransley, Janet. *Third Party Policing*. Cambridge, UK. Cambridge University Press. 2005.
- McIntosh, Malcom. *Corporate Citizenship: Successful Strategies for Responsible Companies*. London. Pitman Publishing. 1998.

- Musselwhite Jr., James. The impacts of new federalism on public/private partnerships. *Publius*, 16(1):113-131. 1986.
- National Institute of Justice. *Hallcrest Report I*. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice. 1985a.
- National Institute of Justice. *Hallcrest Report II*. Washington, D.C. U.S. Department of Justice. 1985b.
- O'Toole, Laurence and Montjoy, Robert. Interorganizational policy implementation: A theoretical perspective. *Public Administration Review*, 44(6):491-503. 1984.
- Peters, Guy. "With a little help from our friends": Public-private partnerships as institutions and instruments. In *Partnerships in urban governance: European and American experience*, ed, J. Pierre, 11-33. New York: St. Martin's. 1998.
- Porter, Michael and Kramer, Mark. The competitive advantage of corporate philanthropy. *Harvard Business Review*:5-16. 2002.
- Savitch, Hank. The ecology of public-private partnerships: Europe. In *Partnerships in urban governance: European and American experience*, ed, J. Peierre, 175-186. New York. St. Martins. 1998.
- Schaeffer, Peter and Loveridge, Scott. Toward an understanding of types of public-private cooperation source. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 26(2):169-189. 2002.
- Taibl, Paul. *Logistics Transformation: DoD's Opportunity to Partner with the Private Sector*. BENS Tail-to-Tooth Commission: Issue Brief. 1999.
- Thompson, James. *Organizations in Action*. New York. McGraw-Hill. 1967.
- United States Department of Justice. *National Criminal Intelligence Sharing Plan*. Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative. 2003.
- United States Department of Justice. *Fusion Center Guidelines: Developing and Sharing Information and Intelligence in a New Era*. U.S. Department of Homeland Security. Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative. 2004.
- White House. Presidential Homeland Security Directive-8. Office of the Press Secretary. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/12/20031217-6.html>. 2003.
- Wilson, Woodrow. The study of administration. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2:197-222. 1887.

Wright, Deil. Managing the Intergovernmental Scene: The Changing Dramas of Federalism, Intergovernmental Relations, and Intergovernmental Management. In *Handbook of Organizational Management*, ed, William B. Eddy. New York. Marcel Dekker. 1983.

ⁱ “All threats and all hazards” refers to the Department of Homeland Security’s focus on not only terrorism, but natural disasters, crime, and biological weapons to name a few. This focus is emphasized in the Homeland Security Intelligence Analysis Priorities.

ⁱⁱ A fusion center is an effective and efficient mechanism to exchange information and intelligence, maximize resources, streamline operations, and improve the ability to fight crime and terrorism by merging data from a variety of sources (USDOJ, 2004).

ⁱⁱⁱ New Federalism refers to the transfer of certain powers from the United States federal government to the U.S. states to restore states’ autonomy that was lost as a result of Roosevelt’s New Deal.

^{iv} For more information regarding the CIP – Community Facilitation Program, funded by the Training and Exercise Secretariat, FEMA-DHS, please visit www.cip.msu.edu

^v Actionable intelligence is intelligence that includes explicit information and permits the development of some form of tactical or strategic action or plan.