

Military Operations Research Society (MORS) Workshop
Improving Analytical Support to the Warfighter: Campaign Assessments, Operational Analysis
and Data Management

April 19-22, 2010, Lockheed Martin Missiles & Fire Control, Orlando, FL

Working Group 2 (WG2) Campaign Assessments Terms of Reference (TOR)

Chair: Colonel Bobby Claflin, Army Office of Business Transformation

Co-Chairs:

Mr. Bill Hershberger EUCOM

Major Greg Boylan, USARPAC

Lieutenant Colonel David Sanders, Center for Army Analysis

Background

Assessments are critical for an organization to understand how well the organization performs its mission; both what it produces as an output and what it achieves as an outcome. Assessments provide a rigorous analytic bridge between the functioning activities of the organization and those decisions necessary to make improvement; often articulated in policies and plans. Assessments often can help identify opportunities for vertical alignment of goals and objectives and the horizontal integration of capabilities to achieve those goals and objectives. The end result of assessments is to continuously improve how well the organization achieves its goals and objectives and to provide opportunities to innovate. Assessments have a role to play before, during, and after an operation and can significantly improve overall performance of the organization. Useful assessments frequently become a management center of gravity, especially under conditions of scrutiny.

Useful means several things. Aligned and integrated assessments within a theater must speak with one voice, establish manageable expectations, and serve many masters. First and foremost, assessments must serve the commander and support decision making. Assessments must add value “down and in” to the subordinate commanders whose assets are being tasked to collect and analyze. Assessments must support reporting requirements “up and out”, often through multiple chains of command to national governments in order to satisfy national security objectives. The proper alignment and integration of assessments is critical to achieve one voice and minimize competition among messages and across resources.

Despite the critical role that assessments play, organizations frequently treat assessments as an afterthought. Assessment capabilities are often recognized as lacking well after deployment and

are subsequently generated out of the institutional force as a temporary loan. A lack of operational assessment doctrine and analytic structure at echelons above division may contribute to this assessment lag. As an analytic community, we need to engender continuous support for effective and useful assessments as part of the standing operating force – on hand, trained, and ready both in war and in peace. We must apply our own tool sets to build the arguments that demonstrate the benefit of effective and useful assessments. We must build the case to create flexible assessment doctrine to serve as a common basis and start point for individual tailoring to the unique circumstances of the warfight. The doctrine must leverage lessons-learned – many of which will be presented at this workshop. We must build the analytic force structure at echelons above division so we are trained and ready to support the Combatant Commander prior to kick-off.

Purpose

The purpose of the session is to leverage the communities understanding of current assessment capabilities, challenges, and opportunities to establish a way ahead that will ensure that our broad and robust analytic community can best support the Combatant Commander and his multiple requirements with an enduring and institutional assessment capability that is well-postured to support the mission before first deployment, during the conduct of operations, and after the cessation of hostilities.

Goals

WG2 will seek to:

- Identify current assessment constructs, capabilities, and methodologies that are successful and that provide opportunity for future, enduring application (as doctrine).
- Identify current challenges (people, organizations, skills, data, training, tools, communications, multiple masters, etc.) to successfully providing useful assessment support across the theater in order to satisfy strategic through tactical requirements and demands.
- Identify opportunities to improve campaign assessments and prioritize the opportunities
- Develop a proposed way ahead for the broad analytic community to partner and improve future campaign assessment support (develop metrics to measure success).
- Propose an outline of campaign assessment doctrine that could form the basis for campaign assessment doctrine development.
- Propose assessment capabilities that should exist echelons above division in order to provide trained and ready operational support into the robust functional support resident across much of the institutional, or generating, force.

Campaign Assessment Working Group 2 Session Agenda

The working group will be conducted in a series of three sessions, with each session focus being discussed by a group of speakers, followed by a focused discussion to answer and address several issues leading to the working group goals.

Tuesday, 20 April 2010

1600-1700

Session 1: Introduction and remarks by Working Group Chair

Wednesday, 21 April 2010

0800 – 1200

Session I: Approaches to Campaign Assessments

Moderator: MAJ Greg Boylan

Speakers/Panelists:

- Colonel Bob Hume or Mr Scott Sanborn (Afghan Assessment Group, ISAF)
- Mr Rick Starkey (CENTCOM J-8)
- LTC Dave Sanders (Center for Army Analysis)

Presentation and Discussion Topics:

- Assessment techniques. What is meaningful in an IW environment?
- Theater Assessment vs Campaign Assessment - what is the difference?
- Unilateral vs multilateral Assessments (ie; NSC vs JFC Brunssum, US vs ISAF)
- Catering to all Assessment audiences in an information/methodology poor but communication rich environment

1300 – 1700

Session II: Approaches to Campaign Assessments

Moderator: MAJ Greg Boylan

Speakers / Panelist:

- Lieutenant Colonel Jack Ware (CAA – Haiti experience)
- Dr. Robert Hannan (SOUTHCOM)
- Mr. Bill Hershberger (EUCOM)

Topics:

- Identify the challenges associated with providing useful assessment information

- Identifying significantly useful data
- Sufficient data collection (balanced across the lines of effort, more than Military Intelligence)
- Minimizing the burden on the warfighter (aligning operations, decisive conditions, goals)
- Common authoritative data (transparency)
- Identifying common threads of Campaign level assessments
- EAD Assessment structure requirements
- Who should be responsible for assessments? Planners/Operators, ORSAs, intel analysts? All three?
- Campaign Assessment Doctrine and Training (or lack thereof)

Thursday, 22 April 2010

0800 – 1200

Session III: Integrated Campaign Assessments

0800 – 1000

Moderator: LTC David Sanders

Speakers/Panelists:

- Mr Scott Sanborn (CAA – ISAF AAG experience)
- (t) Mr Greg Parlier (IDA – OEF experience)
- MAJ Greg Boylan (USARPAC – 25th ID OIF experience)

Topics:

- Integrating Assessments – NSC to BCT level
- Integration between levels: tactical, operational, strategic, and national security level

1000 – 1200: Working group wrap up and out-brief review.