[H.A.S.C. No. 110–118]

IRREGULAR WARFARE AND STABILITY OPERATIONS: APPROACHES TO INTER-AGENCY INTEGRATION

JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

MEETING JOINTLY WITH

TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD
FEBRUARY 26, 2008

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

43–782 WASHINGTON : 2009

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

VIC SNYDER, Arkansas, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania

W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
JEFF MILLER, Florida
PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky

SUZANNE MCKENNA, *Professional Staff Member*
THOMAS HAWLEY, *Professional Staff Member*
ROGER ZAKHEIM, *Professional Staff Member*
SASHA ROGERS, *Research Assistant*

TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

ADAM SMITH, Washington, *Chairman*

MIKE MCINTYRE, North Carolina
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey
JIM COOPER, Tennessee
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia
MARK UDALL, Colorado
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana
KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND, New York
KATHY CASTOR, Florida

MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
KEN CALVERT, California
JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
JIM SAXTON, New Jersey

ERYN ROBINSON, *Professional Staff Member*
ALEX KUGAJEVSKY, *Professional Staff Member*
ANDREW TABLER, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

2008

Page

HEARING:

Tuesday, February 26, 2008, Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations: Approaches to Interagency Integration 1

APPENDIX:

Tuesday, February 26, 2008 37

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2008

IRREGULAR WARFARE AND STABILITY OPERATIONS: APPROACHES TO INTERAGENCY INTEGRATION

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Akin, Hon. W. Todd, a Representative from Missouri, Ranking Member, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee 3

Smith, Hon. Adam, a Representative from Washington, Chairman, Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee 2

Snyder, Hon. Vic, Representative from Arkansas, Chairman, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee 1

Thornberry, Hon. Mac, a Representative from Texas, Ranking Member, Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee 2

WITNESSES

Davenport, Rear Adm. Dan, U.S. Navy, Director, Joint Concept Development and Experimentation Directorate (J–9), U.S. Joint Forces Command 19

Herbst, Ambassador John, Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, U.S. Department of State 5

Holmes, Brig. Gen. Robert H., U.S. Air Force, Deputy Director of Operations, U.S. Central Command 21

Kearney, Lt. Gen. Frank, U.S. Army, Deputy Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command 22

Osborne, Col. Joseph E., U.S. Army, Director, Irregular Warfare Directorate (J–10), U.S. Special Operations Command 24

Vickers, Michael, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities, U.S. Department of Defense 4

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:

Akin, Hon. W. Todd 45

Davenport, Rear Adm. Dan 61

Herbst, Ambassador John 54

Holmes, Brig. Gen. Robert H. 72

Osborne, Col. Joseph E. 79

Smith, Hon. Adam 44

Snyder, Hon. Vic 41

Page

PREPARED STATEMENTS—Continued
Thornberry, Hon. Mac 47
Vickers, Michael 48

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

[There were no Documents submitted.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
Mrs. Davis of California 103
Mrs. Drake 104
Mr. Marshall 100
Dr. Snyder 91

IRREGULAR WARFARE AND STABILITY OPERATIONS: APPROACHES TO INTERAGENCY INTEGRATION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE, MEETING JOINTLY WITH TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE, *Washington, DC, Tuesday, February 26, 2008.*

The subcommittees met, pursuant to call, at 2:06 p.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Vic Snyder (chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. VIC SNYDER, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM ARKANSAS, CHAIRMAN, OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Dr. SNYDER. The hearing will come to order.

As you know, this is a joint hearing that we are having this afternoon between the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of which I am the subcommittee Chair and Mr. Akin is the ranking member and the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Unconventional Threats, and Capabilities of which Mr. Adam Smith is the chairman and Mr. Thornberry is the ranking.

If you have any curiosity about why I am sitting here and Mr. Smith is sitting there, it is because, at some point about 12 years ago, there was a flip of the coin that determined I had overwhelmingly more senior status compared to him, even though the election was the same exact date. But, actually, it is because he is in the West Coast time zone, and the election in Arkansas closed in 1996 slightly before the one in Washington State.

You know, we have a big Presidential campaign going on right now, and all of us have followed this with some interest. I have not heard the phrases "Joint Interagency Coordination Group," "Effects Synchronization Committee," or "Irregular Warfare Fusion Center" come up at any of the debates or any of the speeches of any of our candidates, and yet we are all here today because we think this stuff is pretty important. We think it has a lot to do on some of the good things that have happened in our national security in the past and some of the better things we hope to happen in the future as we get better and better at these interagency relationships, and I, frankly, think we have quite a ways to go. So that is why we are here today.

And we wanted to welcome you, and I think that is all I will say at this point, other than I want to give you fair warning we do have votes coming up probably in the 3:00–3:30 range. I would encourage all our witnesses to summarize your opening statements.

You need to tell us whatever you think you need to tell us, but I would err on the side of brevity, and I personally also would appreciate it if you avoided acronyms. There was a fairly impressive display of acronyms in the written statements. I considered putting up a jar that you would have to throw a dollar in the pot every time you used an acronym. Now this is risky for some of you because I suspect some of you have an acronym that you do not know what it stands for, but that will be fun, too.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Snyder can be found in the Appendix on page 41.]

So Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF HON. ADAM SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM WASHINGTON, CHAIRMAN, TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Snyder.

I agree with all the statements of Mr. Snyder and will be brief myself in respect to time and look forward to hearing from our witnesses and hearing the interaction.

Obviously, these issues are very important. I have spoken to Mr. Vickers about it before. We are very interested in this committee on counterinsurgency, irregular warfare, and what we can do to get better at it, and I guess the one piece that I am interested in most is the interagency cooperation piece, which is why, of course, we have the State Department and the Defense Department here, but there are many other agencies as well who have a piece of this.

And I think one of the challenges in getting this right is figuring out what all of those pieces are and bringing them together, and the model that is, you know, stuck in my mind is what they have done over at Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) on the direct action piece. They do briefings, and they have everybody under the sun from all over the world from a whole bunch of different agencies. They get together—I think they get together once a day—to talk about it, so everybody is on the same page, everybody is playing, everyone has some idea who the other guys are.

I think one of the challenges on the low-intensity conflict irregular warfare piece is, first of all, figuring out who those players are in the various different places, but then getting them together. So I am very interested in your ideas on how we could pull that together because that is my vision, is that we have, you know, that sort of hearing every day the same way they do at JSOC on the irregular warfare counterinsurgency side.

So I look forward to the testimony, and I thank Chairman Snyder for doing this joint hearing.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Smith can be found in the Appendix on page 44.]

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Thornberry.

STATEMENT OF HON. MAC THORNBERRY, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM TEXAS, RANKING MEMBER, TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. THORNBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

You also will not hear in the Presidential debates that this is an issue that Republicans and Democrats, at least on these two sub-

committees, strongly agree upon, that this is a very important matter with a sense of urgency, and I think all of us, who have talked to folks coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan as well as a fair number of people within the beltway, share that sense of urgency that something has to be done to help this government be more effective at the kinds of things that we are talking about today.

So I appreciate you all being here and look forward to your statements.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Thornberry can be found in the Appendix on page 47.]

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Akin.

STATEMENT OF HON. W. TODD AKIN, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI, RANKING MEMBER, OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just to pretty much echo what the others have said, this is an issue—the idea of extending jointness beyond just Department of Defense—that is attractive for a couple of different reasons. One, the potential for improving how we operate with foreign countries is tremendous, and the second is that, unlike most issues that we deal with—you have the liberals, conservatives, Republicans, Democrats—everybody is interested and has the sense that this is a very high payback kind of project to be working on. So just a whole lot of interest.

And if I could submit my opening statement for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Dr. SNYDER. Without objection.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Akin can be found in the Appendix on page 45.]

Dr. SNYDER. Any opening statements of committee members will be made part of the record.

Your all's opening statements, without objection, will be made part of the record.

I also wanted to mention in the spirit of both Mr. Thornberry and Mr. Akin that Bill Delahunt, who is one of the subcommittee Chairs on Foreign Affairs, is very interested in this topic. He and I have talked about doing joint committee hearings on it. Mr. Tierney from the Government Reform and Oversight Committee—he is one of the subcommittee Chairs there—he is also very interested in this topic and would have been here today but for a conflict. And Sam Farr from the Appropriations Committee is very interested in this topic and has attended several of our hearings here.

That is by way of saying this is of bigger interest than just one small or two small subcommittees. I think there is a lot of interest. I know Mr. Skelton is very interested in this topic, too.

With that, Mr. Vickers, we are going to put on the five-minute clock. When the red light goes off, you feel free to keep talking if you have something to tell us, it is just to give you an idea of where your time is at.

Mr. Vickers.

STATEMENT OF MICHAEL VICKERS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS/LOW INTENSITY CONFLICT AND INTERDEPENDENT CAPABILITIES, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. VICKERS. Thank you.

Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Akin, Ranking Member Thornberry, distinguished members of the subcommittees, I am pleased to be here with you today to discuss the Department's progress in developing capabilities and capacities for irregular warfare and stability operations and in integrating these capabilities with those of other U.S. Government departments and agencies.

Today and for decades to come, the United States and our international partners must contend with terrorists with global reach, with rogue regimes that support terrorists and seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction, with threats emerging in and emanating from ungoverned areas and weak or failing states, and with new manifestations of ethnic and sectarian and tribal conflict. Most importantly, many of these threats emanate from countries with which the United States is not at war and thus placing a premium on interagency cooperation and integration. The responses to these many threats extend well beyond the traditional domain of any single government agency or department.

It is my responsibility as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities to implement the vision provided in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) across all of the Department's warfighting capabilities, while providing policy oversight over their employment.

The QDR importantly established that irregular warfare, with stability operations as an important subset, is as strategically important to the United States and the Department of Defense as traditional warfare. As a result, it was incorporated into the Department's force planning construct, influencing not only the size of our force, but the shape of our force and its capabilities as well.

Irregular warfare includes counterterrorism, unconventional warfare, foreign internal defense, counterinsurgency, and stability operations, although stability operations also can be outside of irregular warfare. Many of the capabilities required to execute these missions are resident in some parts of our force, but not with sufficient capacity to meet expected demand. In other cases, we need to develop new capabilities to address emerging challenges.

Rebalancing the overall defense portfolio to ensure that the Joint Force is as effective in irregular warfare as it is in traditional warfare requires focused efforts in three areas: growing Special Operations Forces capacity while ensuring continued quality, rebalancing general purpose force capability toward irregular warfare while maintaining their capability for a conventional campaign, and then promoting increased integration between SOF, Special Operations Forces, and our general purpose forces, between the Department of Defense and our interagency partners, and between the U.S. Government and our international partners.

We are exploring several transformational ways to enhance our irregular warfare capabilities. Very recently, Deputy Secretary of

Defense Gordon England initiated a departmentwide review of the capabilities required to train, advise, and assist foreign security forces. The results from this study will soon be reflected in the Department's strategic planning and resource priorities.

The Department's strategic plan will direct further examination of irregular warfare capabilities across a wide range of scenarios, and it will identify areas where we can accept some risk to increase investment in areas where we are less proficient, including irregular warfare. We are in the early stages of developing a Department of Defense (DOD) directive that takes a comprehensive view of irregular warfare concepts and requirements, and we believe this approach will facilitate more efficient use of our resources.

We strongly support interagency planning efforts in irregular warfare ranging from the Counterterrorism Center to the Interagency Management System, and we have made significant progress across the interagency.

In a separate venue, I would be happy to provide additional detail regarding the progress we have seen in our partnerships with the intelligence community.

DOD strongly supports the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, a $249 million program in the State Department's fiscal year 2009 budget request, which answers the President's call to improve the United States' ability to respond to instability in conflict.

In sum, the Department recognizes that winning the war on terror requires synergistic effort from the entire U.S. Government working by, with, and through our international partners. With your continued support, we will continue to exercise the agility needed to strengthen these partnerships in ways that preserve and protect the values and interests of our Nation.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Vickers can be found in the Appendix on page 48.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Vickers.

Mr. Herbst. Ambassador Herbst.

STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR JOHN HERBST, COORDINATOR FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ambassador HERBST. Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith, Ranking Members Akin and Thornberry, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify.

As Secretary Vickers pointed out, we face unusual dangers today in the world from failed states. These unusual dangers require a new response, a response which takes count of all the assets of the U.S. Government and, for that matter, of U.S. society.

The steps to successfully meet this challenge require doing something that is done by the military, which is building the necessary human capacity to develop planning and management systems, to train experts with the necessary skills in the situations they are likely encounter, and to repeatedly exercise with partners until our people are ready.

At the center of this preparation is the effort to strengthen the partnership within the United States Government between civilians and the military, so that as new threats evolve and possibly

rise to the level of military engagement, we have relationships that will serve our Nation effectively.

My office operates under National Security Presidential Directive 44, which calls on both civilian and military elements of the federal government to promote our national security through improved coordination, planning, and implementation. Our job is to support the Secretary of State in her lead role in integrating U.S. efforts to prepare for, plan, and conduct reconstruction and stabilization activities. A core part of this job is harmonizing civilian and military efforts so that civilians are planning and working with the military before the start of any operation.

Over the last year, we have been working together across 15 civilian and military agencies to significantly improve the management of U.S. Government reconstruction and stabilization operations. This unprecedented process has brought together a tremendous range of experts to determine the civilian capacity of the U.S. Government, what it needs in stabilization operations. It has required an extraordinary commitment to staff and has required expertise that has also benefited from the impressive support from Members of Congress, outside experts, including the academic community.

The examination has identified three required levels of deployable civilian efforts for use in failed states: an Active Response Corps of up to 250 first responders from civilian federal agencies. This Active Response Corps will be comprised of people who are able to deploy within 48 to 72 hours of a decision. They would be able to deploy with the 82nd Airborne, if that was considered necessary.

Backing them up will be a Standby Response Corps of over 2,000 government officials who have full-time day jobs, but who train several weeks a year and who will be able to deploy within 45 to 60 days of a decision. We should be able to deploy anywhere from 200 to 500 of the Standby Response Corps in a crisis.

Backing them up will be a Civilian Reserve Corps, modeled after our military reserve system, comprised of private citizens from across the country who would sign up for four years, who would train for several weeks a year, and who would deploy for up to one year in that four-year period. We are talking about having 2,000 people in the Civilian Reserve Corps of whom we could deploy up to 25 percent at any one time.

The Civilian Stabilization Initiative would create these three corps of people. It was embraced by the President and presented to the Congress in the fiscal year 2009 budget. The cost for this is $248.6 million. The Civilian Stabilization Initiative, as outlined in the President's budget request, will provide a full complement of U.S. civilian personnel that can respond quickly and flexibly to stabilization challenges. It provides for new positions within the U.S. State Department, the Agency for International Development (AID), and other partner agencies devoted to increasing civilian reconstruction and stabilization expertise.

This initiative is a critical first step to ensure that we have the right people with the right skills ready to deploy quickly. However, making sure that these experts are doing the right things on the ground according to one strategic plan, with full synchronization

between military and civilian operations, continues to be the most complex and challenging task under National Presidential Security Directive 44. In response to the challenge, we have created the Interagency Management System. This system fully links efforts of the State Department, the other civilian agencies, and the Department of Defense to ensure a single plan of operations in a stabilization crisis.

We have already been partnering with our other civilian agencies and the military and, for that matter, with international partners to test the Interagency Management System. We have worked out planning systems and potential challenges in the training and exercise environment so we will be ready to respond effectively when the next crisis occurs.

There is no question that failed states represent a premier, if not the premier, security challenge of the next generation. Building a U.S. civilian planning and response capability as embodied in the Civilian Stabilization Initiative will ensure that we are able to partner with the military, providing the necessary skills to deal with our national security challenges.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Herbst can be found in the Appendix on page 54.]

Dr. SNYDER. Gentlemen, we were wrong in our estimation of our times. The beepers went off. There will be a series of votes. We are going to try to get in a question or two or three. I am going to ask one question and go to—who is next then? Mr. Smith?

I wanted to ask, in your written statement, Ambassador Herbst, on page three, you state, "Just as the military underwent tremendous reform in the 1980's following the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, we are proposing shifts across our civilian agencies that will bring all elements of national power to bear in the defense of America's vital interests."

A lot of us have talked about the Goldwater-Nichols, I guess, more as a metaphor or example of proposed change. What do you see that is on the scene right now that rises to the level of the Goldwater-Nichols Reform Act in terms of what is going on? I mean, I do not see that level. I do not see that level of mandate, that level of incentive in personal policies, that level of transparency, that level of drive from the highest levels of government, but what do you see that compares what you all are doing right now to that level of mandate?

Ambassador HERBST. I think that the Interagency Management System under National Security Presidential Directive 44 is roughly analogous to Goldwater-Nichols. This National Security Presidential Directive and our agreement as we implement it have established interagency coordination which did not exist in the past.

We will have an Assistant Secretary level group called the Country Reconstruction and Stabilization Group overseeing policy. Every civilian agency which has assets to bear in a stabilization crisis will sit on this policy group. Under this group, there will be a secretariat which will write a plan of stabilization operations.

If the Civilian Stabilization Initiative is approved, if it is funded, we will create standing bodies of 250 Active Response Corps members who will sit in all civilian agencies, who will train extensively

as a team, who will be represented in my office which will function as an interagency office, to produce an interagency plan with interagency teams to deal with the crisis of stabilization operations.

This will give us an effective interagency tool using each asset of the interagency linked up entirely with our military to deal with stabilization crises.

Now there are some things that could still be done. The Interagency Management System has to be utilized. We have to adjust not just training procedures—that is underway—but also employment practices. But these are things which are right now being considered for addition in, for example, the State Department's personnel system to insist that people get involved in interagency activities, to make that part of the standards for advancement in the Foreign Service.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Smith for five minutes for questions.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you. I will try to be quick.

Just sort of following up on what Dr. Snyder said, I think our real concern on—certainly on my subcommittee that Mr. Thornberry and I have talked about and I think Dr. Snyder shares that concern as well—is the level of commitment to these types of changes, and there are, you know, a lot of things we are worried about that have not happened.

I mean, you look at the Defense Department budget, you know, post-9/11, it has gone up. You can look at that, and you see everything that has happened post-9/11 and really get a good gauge of our commitment to sort of the shooting side of the war, if you will.

On this side of it, on the counterinsurgency, irregular warfare, you know, development aid has not really gone up. The United States Information Agency has been, you know, gotten rid of, not really focused on very much. USAID declassified within the State Department. None of that has been replaced. The budgets across the board for you at State anywhere have not gone up.

And the other question is—when you look at what you are talking about putting together here, the question of sort of who is running it—you know, back to my JSOC analogy, without getting too much into that because a lot of it is classified, I know who is in charge of that, and you can look at that and you can see how they have structured it to make sure it gets done.

On this side of it, it seems like, number one, we were painfully slow to react. We were into 2006 and 2007 before we started doing some of these things, and even now there is a lot of activity, but there is not a lot more money. So where are we pumping the money in? How are we, you know, raising the focus, getting someone who is in charge, really making those shifts?

And I ask that as a friendly question because we on this committee want to help. You know, we want to help direct money. We want to help place greater emphasis there. We just want to get sort of a feeling on the Administration side, what are they truly doing to bring this about, if there are not those changes that I have just talked about in some of the key areas, particularly when you talk about the bottom line, money, getting the money in to really beef these things up.

Ambassador HERBST. Mr. Chairman, I think that there is no question that the fiscal year 2009 budget presented by the Admin-

istration reflects the same concerns that you have just expressed. It reflects the recognition that to enhance our national security, we have to beef up not just the personnel and the budget at the State Department and USAID, but also create this fast response capability, the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, for which I am responsible.

Now, given your concerns, I would hope that there would be support for the budget request we have put forward, but we understand that the budget is an important part—but not the only part—of it. To deal with the type of crises that we are facing and are going to face for the next generation or two, we need to have the interoperability within the U.S. Government on the civilian side which we have not seen in the past.

A very smart guy in my office posted a sign on his door quoting Machiavelli saying, "There is nothing more difficult than to create a new system in government." I can appreciate the insight of Machiavelli, having done this job for the last 20 months, but point of fact, we have made a breakthrough in the Administration.

Over a year ago at an Assistant Secretary level group that I chaired in January of 2007, we reached agreement on the civilian capabilities we need. We reached agreement on Interagency Management System. And this was then approved at higher levels in the Administration.

What we need now is to get the approval and support of the Congress to do this, and with that, we could have this capability up and running within 15 to 18 months, once we have the approval.

And then we will be able to put these civilians into the field, and we will need a vast improvement over how we have been doing things to date, although I am certain we will find new problems that we will have to fix.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Dr. SNYDER. We will give Mr. Thornberry a quick bite at the apple before we have to run.

Mr. Thornberry.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Vickers, let me play devil's advocate for just a second. I would argue perhaps that there are elements of irregular warfare that are fundamentally incompatible with big bureaucracies.

You mentioned in your statement strategic communications, for example. So, whether you are talking about within the Department of Defense or on an interagency basis, if you are not moving in real time with communications and making decisions and getting messages out, you are not a player in the game. If you have to run up the chain of command and get this approval and that sign-off, you are irrelevant to the communications that are going on at that point.

And so the skeptic in me would say adding layers of new coordinating committees is not going to solve this problem. It requires deeper change than that.

Now do you think I am wrong?

Mr. VICKERS. No, I think you are absolutely right. As a veteran of the Central Intelligence Agency, a lot of things that we were able to do in the 1980's depended on just those kinds of shortcuts.

Strategic communications is probably an area where not just the interagency system, but our strategy and, to some extent, our capabilities, but fundamentally our strategic approach has the furthest to go, and I will be quite candid about that.

I think the important point that you were making, which I would underscore, is interagency integration is not enough. You really need interagency capabilities, and you need appropriate strategies. All the integration in the world is not going to work if we do not have the right tools to work with, and that is why things like the Civilian Stabilization Initiative or—as my own Secretary has said, we have done a lot to improve our intelligence since 9/11, we have expanded the Department of Defense, we have done correspondingly less in the Department of the State, and we need to shore up capabilities in that area.

And then I agree strategic communications is an area where there is much to be done.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Akin, when we come back, you will begin. You will get your full five minutes.

I think we are in for several votes. The staff will work with any of you here, both our first and second panel, if you need phones or a private room or whatever it is that we can help you with. I apologize for this, but we will be back.

[Recess.]

Dr. SNYDER. We appreciate your all's patience. The House floor business is done for the day, so unless lightning strikes, we are in good shape here. We appreciate you being here. I know some of you have had to move schedules around.

What we will do is finish with the questions of you, Mr. Vickers and Mr. Herbst, and then have you all slide down, bring our other witnesses, hear their opening statements, and then go another round, and we certainly understand if anybody needs to leave. We appreciate your patience.

Mr. Akin for five minutes.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We were pretty much, as I recall, on the subject of trying to develop this concept of jointness, and I understand, Ambassador, your concept that, first of all, if you start where you are all agreeing to what the plan is, that that is a very good first step.

When we looked at jointness some years ago, I am afraid before my time even, there were several things that were felt were important. One of them was basically to force people to interoperate so you are mixing your management up with people from all sides.

The first question is: Is that necessary?

The second question: I have heard it said the State Department just the way it is organized as an agency does not fit into this kind of concept very well anyway, just because of the structure of the way that they think and organize. I do not know if that is excessive pessimism or realism. I am not sure.

And then the third thing would be: As you take a look at putting things together on the side of the administration, do you have a problem with the fact that—military people, you say, "Go there" or "Do that." The State Department people say, "I do not think I want that assignment. I will take something else." How do you deal with that question?

So I think that is just a start.

Ambassador HERBST. Well, first of all, it is certainly true that in order to develop effective civilian interagency operations, we need to plan, train, and deploy together, and all of this is envisaged under the Civilian Stabilization Initiative. Even before we had put this initiative forward, we had been planning and training together. There have been various exercises, civilian and civilian-military, which have participation from USAID, Treasury, Justice, State and so on. This is the future, and we understand that, and approval by Congress for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative will give us an enormous amount of momentum.

Regarding the State organization, I am not here to address the past. I am here to address what we are doing and what we expect to be doing in the future. We understand—the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) and the Secretary of State operating under S/CRS understand—that interoperability, working with our interagency partners, is absolutely essential to meet our national security interests, and that is what we are developing, and that is what we intend to do.

Finally, the notion of assignments and how people get to go to the world's more interesting and less benign places. The force that we are developing is meant to be used in all circumstances, including hostile circumstances. The Active Response Corps will be deploying people to places where bullets are flying, perhaps along with, at the same time as, our military.

S/CRS has already pioneered this concept in miniature. I have a 10-person Active Response Corps, and my folks have been to Lebanon, to Darfur, to Eastern Chad, to Nepal, to Sri Lanka, to Haiti, to Kosovo. We have been to the places where the chips are on the table.

And when people sign up for the Active Response Corps, they understand that they will be going at times in harm's way, this is part of the pitch, and if people choose not to go, then there are penalties. The penalties are being fired. Penalties are being forced to pay for any training that they may have received. So we believe that this system will work at putting State Department and other civilians into the world's wild places to our advantage.

Mr. AKIN. It seems to me to be odd to hear you say it is the same team that could go to all those different places. I would think you would have people that are sort of both language-wise, but also culturally very attuned to a more specialized block of countries, instead of having somebody that is supposed to speak 100 different kinds of languages. Am I missing something?

Ambassador HERBST. Well, right now, you would say that I have a boutique capability. Ten people are interesting, but not much more than that. With 10 people, there are limits to what you can do.

But if we create a corps of 250 of the Active Response Corps, and then the standby and the Civilian Reserve Corps, first, we will find a number of people have many of the languages that we will need. Second, but more importantly, we will be training, besides the experts to go out, people who have functional skills that we need, police skills, lawyering skills, engineering skills.

We will couple them with area experts, with language experts. So, when we send a team to Haiti, they will include French, and not just French speakers. If we send someone to Afghanistan, they will speak Dari as well as having functional skills, and we will be training people to operate in different environments.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Saxton for five minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. First, let me congratulate you on endeavoring to fix a problem that, as you have heard us all say, we think is quite important.

When we went to Iraq, the first few days of the experience were quite successful, and then we got into a situation that perhaps none of us could have anticipated or did anticipate at least, and during that time, it became obvious that there were a number of issues in Iraq that needed attention. Perhaps as well-intended as we were, we sent a team of folks who did not have all those skills. They were trained to do other things, and they did them very well, frankly. The Special Operations Command did well. The various divisions that were deployed to Iraq did well in doing what they were trained to do. However, they were not trained to stabilize the country.

I have here a little chart that came from a joint publication from Joint Operations on September 17, 2006, and it is a model that depicts various stages of conflict, and we did fine. We seized the initiative, we dominated the military fight, and then we got to the stabilization stage and ran into trouble, and so the stabilization stage, I think, is what we are endeavoring to fix.

Congressman Sam Farr has introduced legislation, which I think you are familiar with, which, frankly, I am a co-sponsor of, and so I think that we owe you a debt of gratitude for endeavoring to put together a program to plug a hole that we see in that phase that this chart calls stabilization because the real aim for us is to get Iraq back up on its feet and other countries that we may be involved in, like Afghanistan, which is also a problem, same kind of problem—different issues, same kind of problem.

So I guess my question is, in a couple of minutes, which is all I have left really in my five-minute time, can you just say, in the case of Iraq, which you are all intimately and painfully familiar with, if your program were in place, how do you visualize it would be dealing with stabilization in Iraq in a way that would better enable us to come to Phase 5, which is turning it over to a civilian authority, the Iraqis?

Ambassador HERBST. Well, it is always a little dangerous to address hypotheticals, Mr. Congressman.

And thank you for your kind remarks.

But let me just make a few general points. If we had at the time of our operation in Iraq the capability that we want to create in this Civilian Stabilization Initiative, we would have been able, one, through the Interagency Management System to draw up a plan of civilian operations that were completely linked with the military plans so that from the moment the military engaged, civilians would have either been alongside of them or ready to move shortly after they had won the military battle.

We would have a single command-and-control structure for civilian operations overseeing all aspects of civilian activities so they would be responsible, for example, for all civilians on the ground, the contractors as well as the members of the U.S. Government. They would be overseeing those contracts that the contractors are performing. There would have been a single address for all civilian activities ensuring that there was no duplication of activities and no operations at cross-purposes.

We also would have, if we had in place the people we are asking for in the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, been able to put into the field, into Iraq, within 60 days of a decision anywhere from 900 to 1,200 people to man this command-and-control structure. They would have been able to begin operations immediately alongside, if it seemed prudent at the time, their military partners.

What that would have done for the outcome is difficult to say, but that is what we would have had, and this is the capability that we are offering you or asking for your support to help us build, and I do not have any doubt this will make our future endeavors, if we find ourselves in similar situations, more successful.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, if I could have just one follow up?

You have talked a lot about partnerships, and I think that is a good concept. But somebody has to be in charge. Who is in charge of the partnerships?

Ambassador HERBST. Well, the way we have structured this in the Interagency Management System, you would have an interagency group at the lower policy level co-chaired by the regional assistant Secretary of State, his or her counterpart at the NSC, and the head of my office.

But point of fact, any serious decisions regarding a major operation would be made at much more senior levels. This group would then have responsibility for overseeing the implementation of that, and chances are that oversight would fall to my office as an implementer. We would not be running policy. We would be overseeing implementation, and you would, therefore, have one-stop shopping when it comes to getting questions asked about how implementation is proceeding.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Kline for five minutes.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen.

I just came back from Afghanistan a week ago today, and what I heard is being echoed all over this place from tremendous American leaders, military personnel saying, "We need civilians." We need farmers for one thing, people who understand agriculture, understand processing, shipping, marketing, and all those sorts of things. So the need is urgent, and the cry is loud, and it is way past time to start doing something about it. So I applaud the efforts being made here.

But I also remember 20 years or so ago when I was still in uniform and we had Goldwater-Nichols, and we decided to do joint and be able to operate, have Joint Operations and "interoperability" was a big word. Frankly, that was a very painful exercise for those of us in uniform. If it had not been for statute, we probably would not have done many of those things. It included orders to places we had not wanted to go to before, going to schools, making the

schools joint, all sorts of things, getting to be Joint Specialty Officers (JSOs) and all of that.

One of those things, clearly, that I think has made a difference and where the Department of Defense and the military services have been able to do as well as they have in meeting responsibilities besides warfighting, besides shooting has come because of the terrific education system that we have. The war colleges, all of them, have done a fabulous job. There has even been sort of token representation from some people in civilian attire, very small numbers, but we are always glad to have them there, and with some of the faculty, you have some expertise in areas besides the uniformed services.

My point is I think that has been an important part of the interoperability and the success that the uniformed military is having, and if we are going to have this sort of success in this interagency operation, I just wonder are there discussions between the departments, within the departments, within State, within other agencies about such an education system that would bring others up to that same level of understanding, either one or both of you?

Ambassador HERBST. There is no question that one of the reasons why the Pentagon produces outstanding leaders is that they have the personnel that can take time off from doing jobs to go into training, and they have excellent courses at the war colleges.

Mr. KLINE. Excuse me. If I can interrupt for just a minute, I would just throw out here that during those early days, particularly in the late 1980's and early 1990's, there were members of the services—I would just pick on the Navy in particular—who said, "We do not have time to do that. We cannot take time off from our regular job. We have to run ships, and we have to do other things." So I do not know if I am detecting a resistance, "We do not have the time to do that," in civilian attire, but I will just tell you that the military services felt like they did not have time to do it either.

So I am sorry. Back to you.

Ambassador HERBST. You detected something that was not there.

Mr. KLINE. Oh, good. I am glad to hear it.

Ambassador HERBST. The point that I started to make was that the Pentagon is sufficiently staffed with people so that they can take time off from their jobs and go to the war colleges, and they have someone else to do their jobs while they are away, and, in fact, going to the war college is an important part of their professional advancement, something they have to do in order to rise in the ranks.

Mr. KLINE. Exactly.

Ambassador HERBST. In the State Department, we do not have the number of people we need in order to take that time off, and, in fact, that is one of the reasons why in this year's budget request we have asked for an increase in State Department personnel to give them time so that they could take time off to do the war college and, for that matter, to do language training.

By the way, this is not my area of responsibility, but I happen to know a little bit about it.

So we get the concept. We need the resources in order to do it the right way. That is point one.

Point two: In the little area that I am responsible for, we get the notion that training is critical. It is critical in part but not only because we are teaching skills which people who join the State Department have not necessarily acquired before they signed up.

But one thing my office does well by State Department standards is planning. We still have a way to go to match our military planners, but we are getting stronger by the week. That is a skill that we are teaching our fellow officers at State. We have created training courses which include planning, which include interoperability with other agencies, including with the military, and anyone who signs up to work at my office takes those courses. For that matter, some staff members in Congress have taken those courses—they can vouch for their utility—as have many soldiers—people going off to Iraq and Afghanistan have taken them and have welcomed these courses—as have foreigners, part of our reach-out.

The point is we get this. We get this.

In order to do it right, though, we will need more resources. The Civilian Stabilization Initiative includes several million dollars—I can give you the exact figure, but I do not have it off the top of my head—for training. If we approve the initiative, we are going to need to train within a few months 44,250 people.

We will do that by using the Foreign Service Institute, by using our friends in the military, the Army War College, Joint Forces Command (JFCOM), and so on in order to give these thousands of people the necessary training they need to be able to go into a difficult unstable environment.

Mr. KLINE. Okay. Thank you.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Hayes.

Mr. KLINE. I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SNYDER. We will go to Mr. Hayes and then to Mrs. Davis and then to Mrs. Gillibrand.

Mr. Hayes for five minutes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Mr. Vickers, I enjoyed being with you Friday.

What guidance has been given to the combatant commanders on pinpointing and prioritizing our stabilizing stability operations and what sort of list has the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) developed that relates to these priorities?

Mr. VICKERS. Well, we started in this area in 2005 with DOD Directive 3000–05, which is military support for stability, security, reconstruction, operations, and then the Quadrennial Defense Review provided additional strategic guidance. That guidance in turn has been implemented in an irregular warfare road map and most recently in the department's strategic plan in the guidance for the development of the force, which lays out investment priorities for fiscal years 2010 through 2015 and then looks out 15 years beyond that.

The combatant commands, as part of this process, sent in their integrated priority lists for capability shortfalls, a number of which now reflect stability operations or irregular warfare capabilities, with Central Command (CENTCOM) being the prime example of that since they have the most business right now. But all the combatant commands basically are stepping up in this area.

One final point, to shape our capabilities in this area, we are completely revamping our defense planning scenarios. Three years ago—this gets into a classified area, but I will talk about it in general terms—we had three scenarios. None of them involved irregular warfare or stability operations.

We are developing a family now, I believe, of about 15 of them. They span homeland defense to irregular war and stability ops to a broader range. There are probably six or seven or so that deal with irregular warfare and stability ops that then ought to shape the future military and, of course, how we interact with our interagency international partners.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, sir. That was not quite as specific as I wanted to get, but——

Ambassador Herbst, have you talked to your folks in the field about the critical importance of interagency communications and how vital that is to the process and how that is being improved? Can you comment on that?

Ambassador HERBST. Certainly it is critical. We understand it. Before the 82nd Airborne deployed to Afghanistan last year to take control of American operations in Afghanistan as opposed to NATO operations, we were asked by the commander to send a team out to improve communications among his staff, the Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs), and our embassies, and we did that.

The Interagency Management System calls for use of something called an integration planning cell, which would be deployed to the regional combatant commander in an operation led by American troops, by that regional combatant commander where there are also civilian operations, to ensure that civilian and military operations are completely linked up.

So we understand that this is critical, and we have built this into our operations.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Dr. SNYDER. Mrs. Davis for five minutes.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you all for being here.

Perhaps this actually just follows, Mr. Ambassador, on what you said and particularly the emphasis on planning, training, and deploying together.

We happened to be at Camp Lejeune yesterday, and they spoke of the training that the Marines will be getting before they deploy to Afghanistan, and I think it is the bulk of the Marines who will be going. I understand that Fort Bragg is perhaps doing some interagency work.

When I asked the general what is going to be different about their training, he spoke about the cultural training and he spoke about the linguistic training. He did not mention, but perhaps it is there, that there would be this kind of interagency coordination going on, and if you talk to anybody who has been out in the field with PRTs, they will say how valuable it would have been had they been able to plan and train together.

Are you working on this with the training of the Marines at Camp Lejeune specifically?

Ambassador HERBST. Okay. We understand the importance of this. We have engaged in training at Fort Bragg. We and USAID

have engaged along with the military at Fort Bragg, but we have not been engaged at Camp Lejeune. It is something we will look into, and if we can make a contribution, we would be happy to.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. I hope you would consider that because——

Ambassador HERBST. Okay. I will definitely look into it.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. It seems like it works, and into everything that you have been saying, and if there is something that Congress can do to be helpful, if there is authority that you need, whatever it is, it sounds like you already have it basically because you are doing it in other settings.

Ambassador HERBST. We have the authority right now to help with training. I have a staff which can do this, but is actually rather small. If the Civilian Stabilization Initiative is approved, our staff will grow much larger and we will have the capability to do a great deal more.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Okay. Great. Thank you. I hope you will follow up on that.

Ambassador HERBST. I will definitely follow up.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. I yield back my time. Thank you.

Dr. SNYDER. Mrs. Gillibrand for five minutes.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for your testimony.

Ambassador, the fiscal year 2009 budget request supports the recruitment, development, and training of 250 interagency Active Response Corps and about a 2,000-member Standby Response Corps. Based on last year's personnel problems and the Department of State requirement to fill jobs in Iraq, do you see this concept as viable, given that these individuals will likely to deploy to hostile environments?

Ambassador HERBST. This is concept is extremely viable. The 250 members of the Active Response Corps will be newly recruited from outside the government or maybe from within the government. We can create 250 positions, and we will be seeking people who have the skills necessary for use in a destabilized country.

People will be hired: A, with those skills; B, with the understanding that they will be going into dangerous places at times; and, C, with the understanding that they will be able to make an enormous difference, including for our national security.

I have done a great deal of public speaking over the past 18 months, and I can tell you there are a lot of Americans who have done well in life in all the skill areas we need who are looking for the opportunity to make a contribution and who would be willing to do something, which is both very adventurous and maybe a little bit dangerous. So I do not have any doubt we will be able to find the people to fill these positions.

The Standby Response Corps will be made up of people who are currently in the government. We will need 2,000 of those. That will, frankly, be a little bit more difficult than finding 250 among the whole American public, but I believe there, too, we have done a great deal of work interagency, reaching agreement on those numbers. We will be using as part of this corps our Foreign Service nationals in the State Department and USAID, people who are actually doing very good work right now in Iraq and Afghanistan,

and I think we will be able to come up with 2,000 members of this. And also we have to find 2,000 members of the Civilian Reserve Corps. Drawing upon 300 million Americans, it is eminently doable.

So there will be some glitches in the system, but the people are out there with the skills, with the enthusiasm, with the patriotism. This is an eminently doable project.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. But why do you have such confidence because, obviously, we have been trying to staff these PRTs for a while, particularly in Afghanistan, and what we have heard from the military is that they are largely staffed by military personnel still. In your memo that is attached to your testimony, it says, "This strategy works to ensure that the United States is ready to meet the next crisis, bringing all necessary expertise to bear." Is it your intention that this will actually take time and not be useful for Afghanistan or Iraq?

Ambassador HERBST. If our budget request is approved, say, in January of next year, then by May or June of 2010, the capability I have described or my testimony describes would be up and running.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. By 2010?

Ambassador HERBST. It will take us 15 months, 18 months to do that. Far be it from me to play prophet. So, if you think that we will be in Afghanistan or in Iraq in a major way at that time, we will have a capability that could be used for those operations in 2010.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. And what would your intention be for long-term sustainability of these two new organizations? I mean, is your goal to integrate this into both the State Department and military portfolio? How would they work together?

And, obviously, if you are going to be sending these folks to war zones, they are going to have to have some kind of protective training, unless you intend to staff all of these teams with military personnel to protect their work?

Ambassador HERBST. People who sign up for this will certainly be trained to operate in hostile environments, and there will need to be some form of security for them. They will also be trained to operate as an interagency team. It will be under the Secretary of State because that is what National Presidential Security Directive 44 says, but my office already has a sharp interagency flavor, and that flavor will only grow, and people will be used to operating as an interagency team because that is the only way we can be effective in these environments.

We will find these folks. It will be a sustainable capability. For example, in the Active Response Corps, we believe, we can keep 80 percent in the field at any one time. Then we will see that 20 percent as people coming in and coming out of the corps.

The Standby Response Corps is a little bit more difficult to put out in the field because these are people who have full-time jobs, so we are only counting on right now being able to deploy 10 percent of them at any one time, but we feel we should be able to work up to 25 percent, but no more.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. That seems like a relatively small number. For example, if we just look at the work that is needed done in Iraq

and Afghanistan today, that seems very small, and one of the things this committee has looked at under the chairmanship of Ike Skelton is renewed view of roles and missions and what could we be doing to think outside the box about how we grow our military to be more effective.

And one of the discussion points that we have talked about is doing exactly what you are doing here, but on a much larger scale and actually training National Guard and Reserve to do some of these stability missions so that we have an ongoing force that is significant to handle not only issues in Iraq, Afghanistan, or elsewhere, but also in the U.S. if we have a terrorist attack here in the U.S., should we have national disasters in the U.S., where you actually need the complement of ability and training to do stability and reconstruction.

And so I see this as a wonderful idea, but it sounds like it is going to take a very long time to put in place, and it is going to be quite small. My concern is it is not enough of what really needs to happen to keep America safe.

Dr. SNYDER. Ambassador Herbst, if I might, why don't we move to the next panel since that time period is up, and I think there will be opportunities to amplify on this.

Ambassador HERBST. So I should or should not answer the question?

Dr. SNYDER. Let's not answer that one right now. I think, given the late hour, what I would like you to do, Secretary Vickers, Ambassador Herbst, if you can kind of slide on down to your all's right—and I also realize that I had neglected to formally introduce you.

Honorable Michael Vickers, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations/Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities in the U.S. Department of Defense.

Ambassador John Herbst, coordinator for reconstruction and stabilization, U.S. Department of State.

You will now be joined by Rear Admiral Dan Davenport, director of the joint concept development and experimentation, U.S. Joint Forces Command; Brigadier General Robert Holmes, deputy director of operations, U.S. Central Command; Lieutenant General Frank Kearney, deputy commander, U.S. Special Operations Command; and Colonel Joseph Osborne, director of irregular warfare directorate, U.S. Special Operations Command.

What we will do is have—I think we have three opening statements—you all come on forward to your assigned pew there, if you would please.

It is my understanding that we have three formal statements here. As I said before, your written statements will be made part of the record. As I said before, feel free to share with us anything you think we need to hear. You may want to err on the side of brevity. And then we will go to members for questions.

Admiral Davenport, we will begin with you.

STATEMENT OF REAR ADM. DAN DAVENPORT, U.S. NAVY, DIRECTOR, JOINT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT AND EXPERIMENTATION DIRECTORATE (J–9), U.S. JOINT FORCES COMMAND

Admiral DAVENPORT. Thank you, sir. Good afternoon.

Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Akin, Ranking Member Thornberry, and members of the subcommittees, on behalf of General Mattis, the commander of the U.S. Joint Forces Command, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

My testimony will address the role of Joint Forces Command in developing irregular warfare and stability operations concepts and doctrine as well as our ongoing efforts to improve interagency integration at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels.

As described in my written testimony, Joint Forces Command is actively contributing to the development of concepts, capabilities, and doctrine to improve U.S. forces' ability to conduct irregular warfare and stability operations and to integrate those operations effectively with interagency and international partners.

Informed by operational analysis, lessons learned, and best practices from current operations, Joint Forces Command provides solutions and practical tools for the Joint Force commander in the form of doctrine, concepts, experimentation, capabilities, exercises, and training. These products reflect the evolution and maturation of military and interagency thought and practice.

The intellectual underpinning of Joint Force Command's (JFCOM's) pursuit of irregular warfare and stability operation solutions and interagency advocacy resides in our joint concept work. Developed in coordination with the Joint Staff, combatant commands, and services, our Joint Operating Concepts address gaps in current capabilities and provide the base for developing solutions for the challenges we face in the future operating environment.

The comprehensive approach to interagency integration is foundational to our concept work. JFCOM's experimentation program examines and validates concepts and capabilities that span the range of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, logistics, planning, and policy activity necessary to provide the Joint Force commander and his interagency partners the capabilities required.

Irregular warfare, stability operations, and interagency integration are major focus areas for JFCOM's Concept Development Experimentation Portfolio. In fact, the largest and most complex projects in my Joint Experimentation Portfolio are focused on these important areas.

Joint Forces Command is committed to provide the concepts, doctrine, and capabilities needed by our Joint Force to integrate effectively with interagency partners in the execution of irregular warfare and stability operations. The continued support of the Congress and these subcommittees for this important work is essential to getting this right.

My written testimony provides a detailed accounting of our efforts, and I ask that it be placed into the record.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I stand by for questions.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Davenport can be found in the Appendix on page 61.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Admiral.

General Holmes.

STATEMENT OF BRIG. GEN. ROBERT H. HOLMES, U.S. AIR FORCE, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS, U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

General HOLMES. Thank you.

Chairman Snyder and Ranking Member Akin, members, today, I will provide a brief description of Central Command's organizations and activities that partner across the interagency as we plan to conduct lines of operation associated with irregular warfare and stability operations.

You have my written testimony, and I ask that it be submitted for the record, but if I may take just a few minutes to hit some high points from that——

In three headquarters organizations—first, the Joint Interagency Coordination Group and then the Effects Synchronization Committee and then an emerging Irregular Warfare Fusion Center—Central Command fosters horizontal and vertical integration of not only our component warfighters' activities but with other interagency instruments of power.

Now this includes the kinetic combative effects that you would expect with traditional military operations, but very importantly goes beyond that, as it includes governance, information, economic development, law enforcement, threat finance, as well as societal and cultural development, all of the elements of irregular warfare, as they are outlined in the Department's Joint Operating Concept for irregular warfare, and I intend to make these injects, these lines of operation, as they are described in that, as part of CENTCOM's review to Assistant Secretary of Defense (ASD) Vickers and his team as they draft a new irregular warfare directive.

In all of this, the overarching importance of strategic communications cannot be overstated. In addition to these three organizations that I have named, we have three tactical level activities, some of which have been mentioned here particularly by Chairman Smith earlier. They are classified within our component organizations, and I would be glad to discuss those in a classified forum.

The battlefield lessons of the last five years demonstrate that conventional military operations are but a single component in a vast array of capabilities that are available to the United States Government to defend our national security interests. The threats that we face in Central Command, as we see them, present themselves as networks of violent extreme actors which are linked and networked beyond CENTCOM's regional boundaries and authorities, thus making us look to the interagency for solutions.

These threat networks are agile and adept, utilizing asymmetric means to attack our strengths. To counter these threats and asymmetric attacks, we envision, if you will, an effective blue force network to achieve unity of effort and purpose across the entire United States interagency and that of our allies, with an aim to foster a blue force network, if you will, to prosecute rapid cross-functional integration across the array of interagency capabilities and thus maximize the effects of an irregular warfare campaign.

The hostile threats that we see went to school in the teachings of Tsun Szu and Mao, and it is clear in those teachings that the key to learning is hearts and minds. So it is clear to secure this

terrain, the hearts and minds of the military instrument of power in and of itself would not be sufficient.

We have achieved success in the security line of operation against mid- and senior-level al Qaeda, Taliban members, in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, but to secure these kinds of gains, we must sustain and refine Central Command's interagency relationships and capabilities.

The Joint Interagency Coordination Group formed in 2001 as a multifunctional advisory and coordinating element works across all directorate lines at the headquarters and that of our components and with our interagency partners to access capabilities and resources to carry out CENTCOM's operations and plans.

The Effects Synchronization Committee is our means to operationalize these interagency activities. So we have coordination, but we must operationalize into our planning and campaign structure. Recent successes of this committee include executive orders to prosecute action with regard to threat finance, and I can go into a number of those, if you would choose, later.

Other Effects Synchronization Committee actions include the criminalization of former regime elements in Iraq and high-valued individuals across our theater in operations combating terrorism. Additionally, this committee has been able to bring about special actions against the violent extreme media outlets.

So, in conclusion, the interagency collaboration of the past five years has matured to a point where we now need to establish an Irregular Warfare Fusion Center. It is our next logical step so that we can focus our interagency integration to current and future needs. This Fusion Center, this Irregular Warfare Fusion Center, will, in fact, be an engine room for developing concepts of operation for irregular warfare and become a focal point for persistent, coordinated, and synchronized efforts to prosecute irregular warfare, but more importantly to identify the measures of effectiveness so that we can gauge our success.

In all of this, we energetically support ASD Vickers in developing a new policy for the department in irregular warfare.

Thank you for this opportunity today to share these views.

[The prepared statement of General Holmes can be found in the Appendix on page 72.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, General Holmes.

General Kearney.

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. FRANK KEARNEY, U.S. ARMY, DEPUTY COMMANDER, U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

General KEARNEY. Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith, Representative Akin, and distinguished members of the committee, thanks for the opportunity to discuss U.S. Special Operations Command's (USSOCOM's) role in irregular warfare as well as interagency coordination and strategic communications.

USSOCOM's mission, as you well know, is to provide fully capable Special Operations Forces to defend the United States and its interests and to synchronize the Department of Defense operations against terrorist networks. Our implementation of a global synchronization process is a continuous systematic program that fuses

the efforts of the combatant commanders, the Department of Defense, the interagency, and our key allies.

We have established a standing interagency task force with USSOCOM members and representatives of 12 interagency partners, linking knowledge with decision makers. Many recognize that the ongoing struggle against extreme terrorist organizations cannot be won strictly through military means. Our Nation's success is dependent on the efforts of the interagency team.

Today's threat is complex and patient. To overcome our enemies, we pursue two mutually supporting and often intertwined approaches: direct and indirect. These approaches integrate the requirement to immediately disrupt violent extremist organizations while positively impacting the environment in which they operate.

The indirect approach addresses the underlying causes of terrorism and the environments in which terrorism activities occur. The indirect approach requires more time to achieve effects, but ultimately will be the decisive effort. This is where irregular warfare actions become crucial.

Irregular warfare encompasses many of the activities normally associated with those found at the low end of the warfare spectrum. It requires getting out and influencing people by engagement and building relations. It is both offensive and defensive in nature. It necessitates a whole-of-government awareness that everyone is a participant, that no one is a spectator. That type of strategic engagement is protracted and must be conducted using regional and global campaigns designed to subvert, disrupt, attrit, and exhaust an adversary and prevent instability from occurring.

While opportunities to push critical United States Government messages abound, many challenges make these efforts more difficult than they initially appear. Additionally, the network asymmetric enemy we face transcends geographical boundaries so commonly used by the U.S. Government to assign communication responsibilities and deconflict the same.

Effective strategic communications represents a defining characteristic in the direct approach that is critical to irregular warfare. Deeds in synchronization with words are at the core of this approach. This is the mindset that has historically allowed Special Operations Forces to gain access, build relationships, foster influence, and legitimize our partners by us being true partners.

This is also the same mindset that is taking hold in the rest of the Department of Defense. Indirect activities, such as foreign counterpart training, civil military operations, information distribution, infrastructure development, and the establishment of medical, dental, and veterinary clinics, are now commonplace in our conventional forces operating in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The need for a unified U.S. Government message which is synchronized across the enterprise is clear. The role of the Department of State as the lead strategic communicator with DOD support is clear. Despite the absence of any compelling structure for integration, there is positive movement in this direction.

I thank the distinguished members of the committee for your role in helping us achieve continued success and enabling us to protect our Nation, and I appreciate the opportunity to be here with you today.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, General.

Is Colonel Osborne going to make a statement or——

STATEMENT OF COL. JOSEPH E. OSBORNE, U.S. ARMY, DIRECTOR, IRREGULAR WARFARE DIRECTORATE (J–10), U.S. SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

Colonel OSBORNE. Chairman Smith, Chairman Snyder, Ranking Member Akin, distinguished members of the committees, I am honored to be here today to report to you on the continuing efforts of the U.S. Special Operations Command to move the irregular warfare concept to a full-scale capability for our command, the department, and our Nation.

I have submitted a statement for the record, but I would like to forego reading the bulk of that to the committees and instead provide some brief opening remarks on the broader context of irregular warfare.

For USSOCOM, irregular warfare is deeply ingrained in our history, culture, and collective experience. For this reason, we assumed the leading role in the development and publication of the Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept following the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review. Key in understanding this concept is the recognition that the center of gravity has shifted from targeting an adversary's military forces or government to influencing populations. While the term "winning hearts and minds" seems trite, in the case of irregular warfare, it is not far off the mark.

In order to maintain the momentum in irregular warfare planning and policy development, the commander of USSOCOM, Admiral Eric Olson, established an irregular warfare directorate designated at the J–10 in June, 2007. We reached our initial operating capability in October of last year, and we continue to expand our capabilities. We work closely with and through the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capabilities to support DOD's efforts to develop and integrate the concepts, capabilities, and capacity necessary to wage protracted irregular warfare on a global scale.

I would like to thank the distinguished members of the subcommittees for the opportunity to be with you here today and discuss this very important topic. This concludes my remarks. I am prepared to answer any questions.

[The prepared statement of Colonel Osborne can be found in the Appendix on page 79.]

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you.

I will now ask questions under our five-minute rule.

I think I will take it off specifically the written statement that you, General Kearney and Colonel Osborne, provided in which you state—I am reading on page six—"Much of the cooperation is initially based on personal relationships," and then it goes on to say, "In short, our success in interagency integration requires constant monitoring and attention."

My question is, if I am a combatant commander today and I decide that I need a brigade combat team with a full complement of skills, not just military, but all the kind of necessary civilian expertise that we have been talking about here today, what structure is

in place today to ensure that when that brigade combat team arrives, the civilian personnel are there, that I, in fact, have the skill sets that I think are required? And then I would like you to contrast that today with what you think it ought to be and any comments that any of you have about that.

General KEARNEY. Thank you for the question, Chairman Snyder.

Dr. SNYDER. My point of that is if I am the combatant commander and I decide I need something, I do not have time to develop personal relationships. We need a structure that ensures that I have the skill sets I need.

Go ahead.

General KEARNEY. Right. The structure in the brigade combat team, as you well know, does not have those additional adjunct capabilities that are required. The combatant commander would then go back through the Secretary of Defense, and he would ask for those capabilities from our interagency partners and identify the skill sets and the capability gaps that he needs to work those.

If the situation was a crisis situation, we would take the assistance that we have, we would work with the country team that is there, and we would begin to move forward based on what relationships the combatant command has and has historically executed. If we have time to train—and we have become very, very effective in this in our pretraining operations to bring a unit forward—we normally bring them in at our pre-readiness exercise before deploying, and we can do that. But there is not currently a structure that partners interagency folks with U.S. brigade combat teams in order to rapidly give you that fused team that we do through relationships now.

Now, in many of our commands, we have had a long-term historical relationship with interagency partners. In particular in some of our Special Operations organizations, and the history that we have today with seven years of combat, we have begun to build those relationships. So very much so folks know who to go and ask for by name that they have worked with over time.

I think that General McCrystal would tell you from Task Force 714 that one of his major efforts underway is to professionalize the force, and that is exactly what he is trying to do, is build those long-term relationships through habitual assignments.

Dr. SNYDER. My follow up would be going back to when I cut off Mrs. Gillibrand in discussion with Ambassador Herbst, and Ambassador Herbst and I have had this discussion at previous hearings. The structural changes that you all are talking about are for future crises, and you are not satisfied. You just went through a series of things. We will begin moving forward. Well, you know, we have already gone through that, and we had a very unhappy Secretary Gates testifying here, sitting right there, about how dissatisfied he was with the responsiveness of the current system.

This is like five years after we were in Afghanistan. So we do not have a system. We are not talking about something for future conflict, when we have been at least in Afghanistan since 2001. So you are not satisfied with what you describe? Is that a fair statement?

General KEARNEY. Absolutely not, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SNYDER. Secretary Vickers, Ambassador Herbst, do you have any comments on the issue? I am talking about the person on the ground who thinks they needs skill sets and what system do we have today versus what we think we ought to have for getting them.

Mr. VICKERS. We have a ways to go, Chairman Snyder. We are making some steps. For instance, we have shifted our civil affairs, which is military analog in terms of capabilities, of some of the civilian capabilities we need to build in other government departments and agencies. We are partnering one reserve civil affairs brigade with each BCT, brigade combat team, and the Marine Corps and Navy are expanding their civil affairs capabilities as well.

As you know, in Afghanistan, on an ad hoc basis, we now have embedded PRTs with the BCTs as well, forming relationships, but we need to institutionalize these capabilities and develop more habitual relationships, as Ambassador Herbst's capabilities come on stream.

Dr. SNYDER. Ambassador Herbst, I do not have much time. If you would err on the side of brevity here, but respond to me and to Mrs. Gillibrand's comments before.

Ambassador HERBST. Respond to you?

Dr. SNYDER. Yes. And Mrs. Gillibrand was on the same thing about future.

Ambassador HERBST. The point is very simple. Our office would not exist if we did not realize there were inadequacies in the way we are responding, and we represent a way to solve the problems we have been identifying.

Thank you.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Smith for five minutes.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I actually think I have probably more than five minutes worth of questions and answers, but I will live with the five minutes and I may have a follow up at the end if we do not have too many members here.

I think from what we have heard from all of you, the Joint Operating Concept and Directive 44 and what is going on with that, sounds promising, but seems more of a crisis response setup, and it seems sort of focused on Afghanistan and Iraq. You know, we were not ready when we had to go in there and do that. You know, how can we get ready for those two and be ready for the next one? I think that is fine. I think it is definitely something that we will need to beef up as many members and all of you have pointed out as well in terms of resources and so forth.

But what I am really looking for is a more comprehensive strategy that does not wait for the crisis, and I would recommend to you something the Brookings Institution put out this morning. We did a little conference on the release of the report on failed states, which is an incredibly comprehensive analysis of, I think, over 100 countries and their various level of failure in four different areas—economic, political, security, and also social welfare—that gives sort of a blueprint of where our problems might crop up and how we might get in front of them.

And if you can dovetail that over, you know, where is al Qaeda operating, where are they spreading their message, then that feeds back into the strategic communications piece of, you know, how are

we countering that message, what is the message, how are we countering it. That, I think, is the kind of comprehensive approach we need.

I mean, once you get to the state where you are at in Iraq and Afghanistan—it has to be done, no question. We have to dive in there and work at it—I think you would all agree, having been there, it gets real difficult, you know, once the existing structure has been blown up and conflict reaches that level.

And we have to do it, but if we do it in a more preventative manner, I think we can be far, far more successful, and toward that end, I guess the first question I have is—there are a lot of resources involved in that sort of development effort, and I am wondering about the possibility of leveraging non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and public-private partnerships. I have talked to some of you about this before.

Obviously, on the strategic communications piece, you know, we have to do that with the government. We cannot be envisioning some NGO that we try to enlist as our propaganda tool. That would undermine their mission. It would not successfully deliver ours.

But if you are looking at a failed state, if you are looking at the type of reconstruction we are talking about—and there are organizations out there that are building schools, that are providing health care—leveraging those dollars would make an enormous amount of sense. Now that is difficult in Afghanistan and Iraq because a lot of those people have been, you know, kidnapped or killed and they have been a little discouraged. It is going on, certainty in Afghanistan, less so in Iraq.

I am curious what your experiences have been in those two places and what you might think about better leveraging those.

And, Mr. Vickers, I do not know if you want to start out and then anyone else who wants to dive in.

Mr. VICKERS. To the general point about strategy, you are absolutely right that the way we believe we will win the war on terror is through steady-state continuous operations that prevent crises from developing by shoring up our partners, through a full range of national instruments, rather than responding to acute crises when they develop.

Now we need to have these response capabilities, no question, but we believe most of our successes around the world will come from prevention and, accordingly, we are shifting resources in the Department from responsive capabilities to more proactive, and that cuts across irregular warfare and stability operations, from counterterrorism to train, advise, and assist versus large-scale counterinsurgency, a number of efforts I could go into in more detail.

But you are absolutely right about the strategic comparative of doing so.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you.

Does somebody else wish to take a crack at it, jump in?

General KEARNEY. Chairman Smith, one comment: We work right now at SOCOM in a nascent relationship with the business executives for national security who have actually come to us and talked to us, a wide group of businessmen that have interests in the security of the United States, but would like to take their ac-

cess and their abilities for many reasons, not just as good patriots, but also because there is a market, there is opportunity out there for them, and so we are bringing them in and taking a look inside of SOCOM now at how we can work with that group in particular and then others like it to help them come in and help us do our job better.

Mr. SMITH. All right.

General HOLMES. Chairman Smith, if I may just for a moment, as we look forward into the future and work past Iraq, past Afghanistan, in Central Command, we are seeing the need for a comprehensive theater campaign across the framework of Theater Security Cooperation that uses the interagency. One thing that we are doing with our Effects Synchronization Process is to bring those irregular elements, non-traditional elements, of the instruments of power into our traditional planning process to do just that for the long haul.

Mr. SMITH. And I will follow up just quickly and sneak my last question in here. It is a more specific question. It follows up a little bit on this, and this has to do with the deployment of the Special Ops Forces, and I am interested in Mr. Vickers' standpoint and also General Kearney's, and that is the idea of forward deployed versus being deployed back closer to home.

Now, obviously, there are several levels to this, and the biggest point here is most of the SOCOM guys I talk to, you know, they want to be closer to the populations they are trying to work with because they are a key piece of the irregular warfare that we are talking about here, work that is going on in the Philippines and Africa and a bunch of other places that are developing relationships with the population.

Now, obviously, this means more than just, you know, where they are currently deployed overseas, which are not necessarily the hotspots. What are your thoughts in terms of the forward deployed versus being back here and then sending them out?

Mr. VICKERS. The broad strategic shift we are trying to make for the war on terror with our SOF posture is to go from episodic presence around the world to persistent presence. Doing that, of course, requires more capacity, ability to integrate better with the existing structure the U.S. Government has overseas, and then a balance between forward station forces, which, again, may not be forward based in just a region, but specifically in 59 some plus Global War on Terror (GWOT) priority countries while supplementing that with rotational forces, and that mix is something under study.

If we went all the way to rotational forces, it would be more expensive and hard to get the persistent presence that you get from, say, as our State Department colleagues and agency colleagues do, living in a country for a period of time and developing those relationships and language skills. On the other hand, the rotational capability gives the combatant commanders flexibility to move quickly across a GWOT area.

So there is a balance that is needed there, and it is something that we are continuing——

Mr. SMITH. And you do not have a set plan right now? That is still something you are——

Mr. VICKERS. We are developing a plan and, of course, as you know, 80-some percent of our forces are currently engaged in Iraq and Afghanistan——

Mr. SMITH [continuing]. Which makes it difficult.

Mr. VICKERS [continuing]. Which is why we need to grow the force, growing various parts of the U.S. Government, to meet what we see as the future demand.

Mr. SMITH. Great. Thank you.

General, do you have anything to add to that?

General KEARNEY. Yes, Chairman Smith. We are right now finalizing what we call the global SOF posture, which is exactly what you are referring to, our deployments worldwide and where we would sit permanently, and, as Secretary Vickers has said, where we would have a rotational presence.

We are due to present that back to the Joint Staff in March, and we continue to come back, and the key principles are exactly as you have said, persistent forward presence with the right people at the right place to build those relationships, and I think what you will find is that in each geographic combatant commander's Area of Responsibility (AOR), we will probably have a different approach based on the ability to be there, our access, and our ability to get to where to where we need to go and overcome the tyranny of distance, yet balance the deployment of the force away from their families and where they need to be.

But we have that on the plate. Admiral Olson is digesting that now, and we are making the final fine tunes before we come back to the Joint Staff and the Secretary of Defense on what that will look like.

Mr. SMITH. Great. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Akin.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Just a quick question along the same lines as a couple of my previous colleagues were asking, and that is, obviously, it is a lot cheaper if you can work on a more preventive side, and I assume that special operators have been doing that for some long period of time. What is the shift? Is it more from a continuous presence to just go in and take out-one particular problem? Is that how the new system is supposed to operate?

And, also, what is the change particularly with Directive 44 in terms of the decision of when you make preemptive kinds of moves within a country. Is that mostly done in a joint context with the leadership of that country? If you could just develop that little bit.

Mr. VICKERS. Well, I will start, and then I think Ambassador Herbst will want to talk about National Security Presidential Directive–44 (NSPD–44), but the shift to more of a preventive or proactive posture has to do more with having persistent presence in more places than we have had before and trying to be proactive, for example, about counterterrorism, rather than being reactive. Rather than waiting for terrorists to do something and then responding to it, we are out trying to deal with them.

A large part of this preventive posture is really building the capacity of our international partners. The war on terror absolutely requires that. It requires the U.S. Government harnessing its in-

struments with our other partners to support the security of a number of countries around the world, and that is really how prevention would take place, by bringing these various instruments, development aid, political development, security assistance, focused on trying to prevent insurgencies from ever starting in the first place or keeping them at very low levels.

Ambassador HERBST. I would endorse what Secretary Vickers said. You might say there is a military and a civilian component to preventive measures, and most of the measures would be on the civilian side, and there you are talking about most effectively doing this work with a civilian capacity, and the capacity we are trying to grow would enable us to put dozens or even hundreds of people on the ground, civilians on the ground, to do preventive work, and we have devoted a great deal of attention to prevention.

Mr. AKIN. I just got back from a visit to Japan and South Korea, had a chance to talk to that shy and retiring General Bell, and he had his ideas about the importance of having basing on the continent there and an overall perspective. It seemed to me that just as dealing with little problems, prevention is a good thing and working jointly with other countries is a good thing.

It appeared that he was advocating the same thing to deal with big problems, and that was, again, that when you develop allies like Japan with the missile-defense destroyers that they are building that that also is a very good strategy, both financially, economically, but also in developing those partnerships in other countries that can have a different perspective in terms of dealing with things politically. They represent a different interest and, therefore, can sometimes prevail on someone to think in a certain way that we could not.

Anybody want to comment on that?

Mr. VICKERS. I will be talking tomorrow to the Strategic Forces Subcommittee just about cooperative missile defense, so I agree fully.

Ambassador HERBST. An important part of what my office is trying to do is to grow the international capability to respond in stabilization crises. Like you, I took a trip to East Asia—this was last spring—to talk about cooperation with the Japanese, with the South Koreans, as well as with the Chinese. We see a great many potential areas of involvement around the world, and the United States is not going to do all of them or even most of them. We are looking for as many partners as we can find, and we are getting a positive response.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Marshall for five minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It works now.

In an ideal world, we would not even have these hearings, threats would not be there, and we would not have to spend any money trying to address those threats, reorganize ourselves, et cetera. We accept that the threats that are most pressing and likely to be so for the next few decades for the foreseeable future that we are not able to address well are unconventional.

We are not well set up to deal with world pandemics. We are not set up to deal with angry young men forming cells that get access

to growingly lethal things and wanting to damage, many of them motivated by religion, but motivated by other things as well, scattered around the globe.

We accept that climate change is going on, at least most of us do at this point, and that there is going to be substantial economic disruption as a result of that, and all of us recognize that, what, a third of the world maybe is living on less than $2 a day, and they know how we live. So there are huge challenges here, and they are scattered around the globe, and it would be nice if they would all go away, but they are not.

And we also recognize that we cannot meet all those challenges. We need the leverage, we need to build partner capacity, et cetera, and ideally other states would keep those challenges from ever becoming a challenge to us. And this is what you guys think about all the time. You think about it from the perspective of the specific roles that you have. So it is DOD, it is State, it is SOCOM, it is the specific things that I need to do, how I need to adjust, how my group needs to adjust in order to better address the situation.

I would like each of you to think about what you have read lately, you know, authors, articles, books, critics, commentators, the people you think have been particularly perceptive about the threats and how we as a country need to try to reorganize ourselves, as a country, not just your individual bailiwicks, how we need to reorganize ourselves so that we maximize our effectiveness in the long run in addressing those threats.

I would like each of you to think about that for just a second and independently just tell me who out there you think is quite thoughtful about this, has written some good stuff, has some good views, and I would like you to be open-minded enough to say, frankly, they are kind of critical of what we are doing, you know, they do not agree with me, but they are pretty thoughtful.

And then the second thing I would like you to offer me is where you think we are falling short, we are clearly going to fall short, we do not have it right now, we have not quite figured it out.

And if you would just run through, I have only five minutes here. So if each of you could take 30 seconds or so and quickly give me answers to that, it would be helpful.

I guess, Mr. Vickers, we will start with you since you started off the whole hearing.

Mr. VICKERS. Sure. A couple of good things I have read recently. David Ignatius had a good column, I think, a couple of weeks ago. He just came back from a trip in Iraq and Afghanistan and talked about the combination of soft power and hard power through PRTs and Special Operations Forces.

I think there is a lot more going on there than that, but he captured the essence of a couple of important instruments that we have and how in some cases we are leveraging small amounts of capability to really achieve outsized effects. You know, things have gotten worse in Afghanistan, but they could have gotten much worse. The much feared 2007——

Mr. MARSHALL. We are not going to get through the whole list before the chairman cuts us off, if you editorialize——

Mr. VICKERS. All right. The second thing is Bob Kaplan, stealth supremacy, an article in The Atlantic recently about how to do a global posture. Recently. It is probably two years old or so.

Shortfalls—I talked earlier about strategic communications. I think the war on terror requires a different approach than the approach we have had in the past, and I think that is still the hardest problem that we are facing.

Ambassador HERBST. There was testimony given a few weeks ago by among others Carlos Pascual and Michele Flournoy about developing a civilian responsible capability, which I would recommend.

If you talk about something a little bit broader focused, I forget the author's name, but the book, The Pentagon's New Map, is very, very interesting and worthwhile reading. There is a book by Frank Fukuyama on nation-building which is a cautionary book which I think is worth reading, as well as the RAND guide to nation building.

Thank you.

Admiral DAVENPORT. At Joint Forces Command, we developed a product called the Joint Operating Environment, which is a future look at what the operating environment might be, and it gets to many of the threats that you just talked about, and so we see that there is a wide expanse of possibilities out there, but what is foremost on our scope right now is irregular warfare.

Colin Gray has written some recent articles and books on irregular warfare and the challenges we face there that we are looking at real hard right now, and Joint Forces Command overall has an increasing emphasis on trying to ensure we are addressing that irregular warfare threat and the challenge we face in the future.

General HOLMES. I would say Dr. Joseph Nye at the JFK School of Government, a lot of writing about soft power that I have read recently, and then the occasion about eight or nine months ago to hear Newt Gingrich as he went through changes that he felt like had to be made across our structures.

Where we are falling short—I think being able to articulate exactly what strategic communications is or is not and then being willing to do it, and then also to articulate what irregular warfare is and what it means to us.

General KEARNEY. I think the two authors that I have read certainly that best describe the threat are George Weigel—it was a book given to me by former CIA Director Woolsey, and I forget the title, and I will get it to you, sir—and then Walid Phares' Future Jihad. Both get right at the core of why jihadis are what they are.

And then I would tell you the thing that keeps me awake at night is that we have failed to educate American on the threat. We knew more about the Soviet formation that moved across the Fulda Gap than we know about the threat facing us today, and we have failed to provide them that narrative is our strategic communications.

Colonel OSBORNE. Yes, sir. I do not recall the author. A retired British general published a book called Utility of Force, an exploration of how force applies in the broader context of irregular scenarios, and he cited many instances in his career spanning his early days in Northern Ireland through Desert Storm, Desert Shield.

The other one is a book called Infidel by Miriam Ali. It is a compelling personal narrative of a woman's journey from Somalia to actually living in the United States, and while her story is compelling, her street-level observations on the changes that were taking place in a society in the 1980's, early 1990's are indicative of the sort of awareness that we need to be able to develop to understand culture, societies, and secondary and tertiary effects of what is happening in our strategic global enterprise.

I think, sir, the most frustrating thing that we see right now, almost everybody has hit on it, is the strategic agility side of how we deal in this 21st century. We tend to move in a cumbersome, lethargic way, particularly compared against our current adversaries, and plowing through that is one of the greatest challenges that we face.

Dr. SNYDER. Are you done, Mr. Marshall?

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you for the time.

Dr. SNYDER. That list of readings makes my reading a couple of nights ago, Llama, Llama Red Pajama to my son seem kind of lightweight, but——

[Laughter.]

Dr. SNYDER. Mrs. Gillibrand for five minutes.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you for your testimony.

I want to follow up on the issue of the primacy of strategic communication.

Colonel Osborne, in your testimony, you say, "While opportunities to push critical United States Government (USG) messages abound, many challenges make these efforts more difficult than they initially appear. For example, the ability to communicate in the most appropriate medium is not necessarily aligned with the authority to do so."

Can you expand upon that and tell me what authority you are lacking and what you are referring to?

Colonel OSBORNE. Yes, ma'am, and I will try to answer that, and then I will defer. I am not by career field a strategic communicator.

I think most important when we talk about strategic communications from the soft perspective, and I think the irregular warfare perspective, it is important to note that we are talking about deeds. That is the most compelling message that we send, and it is lining up all of the other communication mediums to support that.

And I think that that, in many cases, has been that struggle where we are capable fully of planning operations and doing so in a way from the tactical to the strategic continuum that are achieving good effects and clearly articulating our desires and eliciting the behaviors that we want, but on the flip side, not being able to at the same time recognize that primacy of the communications side to attach to those deeds, and be able to push that through, as I said a moment ago, a somewhat cumbersome bureaucracy that allows us to link those two elements most effectively.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I think in your testimony you said that you thought the State Department would take the lead with support from the DOD. I would like comments from the State Department on what you think that would mean and whether there are barriers for you to do that now.

Ambassador HERBST. If we set up the Interagency Management System, there will be an interagency group which develops the concept as to how we would deploy in a stabilization operation. There will be irregular warfare circumstances where the State Department would not be engaged or there may be somewhere that we might be engaged in a strictly supportive role. It will depend upon the circumstances. There is no single answer or single template to deal with the problems we are facing. There needs to be flexibility.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Thank you.

I would also like to turn a little bit more to the challenges of recruitment. Obviously, you have all created an idea and a plan about how to restructure to handle stability and reconstruction operations better, but my concern is that we have not put in place a plan to really achieve what your goals are in terms of the recruitment to have the diversity of manpower.

And I would certainly like some thoughts from Special Operations forces because if our goal was to double the size of Special Ops within the next two or three years, I do not think that is physically possible based on earlier testimony I have asked from various generals who have come before this committee. So I would like you to talk a little bit about your plans for recruitment and retention, how you can diversify and have these skill sets that you are looking for.

Again, I would like you to also talk a little bit about National Guard and Reserve because one thing the National Guard is doing is they have deployed the agribusiness development team to Afghanistan, which I think is fantastic because what these teams will be able to do is help address the issue of whether you can have replacement crops, whether you can create economic development through agriculture that is beyond opium, and I think that is a very important step for the future of Afghanistan.

Can you envision a National Guard in particular where you do have these individual skill sets already developed within the population because of the nature of the Guard and the Reserve as part of this solution, even though the testimony we heard earlier is not going to draw from our current forces? So I would like you to comment on that.

And then last, just because I want to get all my questions in, I am very concerned about cyberterrorism, and as part of the process of reforming our abilities, what kind of recruitment are you doing to get our best engineers and technology experts from the best engineering schools in the world to want to serve in this capacity so that we have the strength that we need to make sure we keep this country safe?

And I only raise the question because in the news this morning, in Pakistan, you know, they were able to shut down YouTube. A country shutting down a Web site, very unusual. It has been done before in a number of countries, but the capacity of cyberterrorism is growing, and I want to make sure we are prepared.

General KEARNEY. Yes, ma'am. I will try to quickly move through those and then leave time for others to comment.

First off, recruiting-wise, I think we are doing very, very well right now. We are moving through in our five-year plan to expand five Special Forces battalions. We are adding the five psychological

operations (PSYOPs) companies, and we are expanding from a battalion to a full civil affairs brigade in the active component.

Those are moving at the right pace. We have accelerated the amount of people we can put through the school, and, of course, humans being more important than hardware and quality being more important than quantity are principles we live by, and we are pacing ourselves to do that. To double the size of Special Operations Forces, as you have stated, would not be possible in a three- to five-year period, and I think we are moving at a rate that we can sustain for a period of time for those forces.

In the National Guard and the Reserve, we have a great breadth of skill sets that come and work for both our special forces, our civil affairs brigades, which are 90 percent in the Reserve component, and our PSYOPs groups, and we have recruited those specialists into those forces and they do day to day in their civilian jobs exactly what we would like them to do.

We have become through the long war prisoners of our mobilization policy. When you put those skill sets alone in the Reserve component, then as you achieve mobilization horizons, you now are without them for a period of time unless you grow the capacity in the Reserves as well as the active component. So, right now, we are a prisoner of the pace at which we are operating.

From a cyberterror point of view, one of the things that Admiral Olson is trying very, very hard to do is have more influence with the services on recruiting, retention, and how we go after and target that soldier that will become the Special Forces cyberterror operator of the future, and that is one of the things that we are working with the services right now.

But to get that caliber of individual, it is often very, very difficult to recruit that person in at pay levels that are not commensurate with what his skills or her skills would draw on the outside without tremendous bonuses and other things, and I think we are trying to explore that. We have built some capability inside of our Special Operations Forces and some of our special mission units to do just what you are talking about and partner with our interagency partners in the intelligence community who are doing this.

But we are all competing for the same pool and so, again, as the ambassador has stated, very often we need to work to how are we going to gain this capability, who is best suited to bring that on board to work.

But I think your questions are all spot on, ma'am.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Will you follow up with me on what your plan is, particularly for recruiting with cyberterrorism, because you may well have to create a different kind of formula to get these best and brightest in technology to want to, number one, serve in the military and, number two, it may require higher pay. But I just think it is such a vital component that we have not developed yet, that it may require thinking outside the box because a typical individual who may be willing to serve this country may not be that engineering graduate who could go work at some dot-com for an extraordinary amount of money to bring them in to public service.

General KEARNEY. Exactly. And I would tell you that we are nascent, and what I would need to do is come back to you with a more detailed strategy to answer your question, but what I can tell you

is what we have done successfully in other special missions units is to profile the person who has a propensity to do that, to do it well and will stay, and I think our first approach will be to take a look at the folks we have who are doing that very, very well, analyze their psychological, physical, and mental profiles, and then go, "How do we get at them?" and then "What are the incentives it will take to make them join our force?" or another agency's force to do that.

But I would be glad to come back to you, ma'am.

Mr. VICKERS. If I could add to that, in my interdependent capabilities hat, I have oversight of our cyberwarfare capabilities across the Department of Defense. Some of this we would have to discuss in classified session, but cyberwarriors, while very different people than Special Operations warriors, are attracted by a similar motivation in some cases to work on problems you simply cannot work on anywhere else.

I just spent the day out at the National Security Agency (NSA) a couple of days ago, and that challenge of dealing with growing threats to our Nation, whether they come from states or non-state actors is something some Americans thankfully take on as a very serious responsibility, and we are making good progress, but I would have to talk to you about in another session.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you.

Mr. Smith, anything further?

Mr. SMITH. Nothing from me, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. SNYDER. Mr. Akin?

Mr. Marshall, anything further? You need any more books listed there for you? [Laughter.]

Dr. SNYDER. Yes. Mr. Marshall would like to have all that listed down and passed out to all the committee. Yes.

I was struck, in closing, Colonel Osborne, by your phrase "strategic agility," and we hear a lot of terms.

One of them is "soft power" that we use, I think, as an important phrase. It implies no sense of urgency about it, and soft power kind of, I think, implies that you could just spend days and weeks and months trying to get the process together to get everything together that you need. If that included veterinarians or whatever, you would have time to do it.

"Strategic agility," I think, is more of the goal, I think, of the interest of these subcommittees and others, which is that needs to be available on day one, that if you decided you need to have a combat team plus two ag officials or three State Department trainers in local government that they would be available, too, and I do not think that any of us think that we are anywhere near that right now as far as we are into these wars that we are fighting.

We appreciate your time. I apologize again for the interruptions. Both your written statements and your conversation today have been very helpful.

We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 5:10 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

FEBRUARY 26, 2008

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

FEBRUARY 26, 2008

Opening Statement of
Chairman Dr. Vic Snyder
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations

Joint Hearing with the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities on "Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations: Approaches to Interagency Integration"

The hearing will come to order. Good afternoon and welcome.

Our hearing topic today is "Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations: Approaches to Interagency Integration." Today's hearing is a little unusual in that it is a joint hearing conducted by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations and the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities.

Since many of the topics we're going to cover at today's hearing will overlap between the work that our O&I Subcommittee has been doing and the jurisdiction of the Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee, Chairman Smith and Ranking Members Akin and Thornberry and I agreed that we should hold this hearing as a joint hearing between our two subcommittees.

I truly appreciate this collaborative spirit that has always been a hallmark of the House Armed Services Committee and look forward to a very productive hearing.

Our subcommittee's case study on PRTs and its related work on stability operations and interagency integration have served to highlight, again and again, the need to improve "whole of government" efforts to achieve "unity of effort" in all aspects of national security policy, planning, and operations. That goes to all levels of policy, planning, and operations, be it at the national strategic level here in Washington, at the theater operational level which our second panel of witnesses will be able to discuss today, or at the tactical level where PRTs operate.

At our last hearing, Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Policy Ryan Henry came up to me at the end of the hearing and made a point of telling me how genuinely pleased he was to appear before our subcommittee to discuss the importance of improved interagency integration and "the need to ensure that our national security system is adapting to provide the proper tools, processes, and incentives to encourage cooperation across the government" not only among the Departments and Agencies but also between the Legislative and Executive Branches.

As you all probably know, Secretary Gates has made several notable speeches on this topic. He's said: "Looking forward, bureaucratic barriers that hamper effective action should be rethought and reformed. The disparate strands of our national security apparatus, civilian and military, should be prepared ahead of time to deploy and operate together."

The Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee heard from Ambassador Herbst in October, so we'd like an update on his progress. We also heard from Secretary Vickers' boss, Ryan Henry, and the Deputy Secretary for Stability Operations, Celeste Ward, so his insights will be very important.

The intent of this hearing is to receive testimony from our witnesses on how well we're doing in integrating, not just DOD's, but the entire U.S. government's, efforts in irregular warfare and stability operations; we'll hear about the State Department's Civilian Stabilization Initiative; and we'll hear about how the combatant commands are working to involve their interagency partners at the operational level.

On our first panel today we are joined by:

The Honorable Michael G. Vickers
Assistant Secretary for Special Operations,
Low Intensity Conflict, and Interdependent Capabilities
Department of Defense

Ambassador John E. Herbst
Coordinator, Reconstruction and Stabilization
Department of State

After their statements, our members will have questions. Then, our first panel will be joined by our second panel of witnesses, who are:

Rear Admiral Dan W. Davenport, USN
Director, Joint Concept Development and Experimentation (J-9)
U.S. Joint Forces Command

Brigadier General Robert H. Holmes, USAF
Deputy Director of Operations
U.S. Central Command

Lieutenant General Frank Kearney, USA
Deputy Commander
U.S. Special Operations Command

Colonel Joseph E. Osborne, USA
Director, Irregular Warfare Directorate (J-10)
U.S. Special Operations Command

I understand that SOCOM will only have one statement, but that General Kearney will introduce Colonel Osborne.

Welcome to all of you and thank you for being here. After Mr. Smith's opening remarks, and our Ranking Members opening remarks, I'll turn to our first panel of

witnesses for a brief opening statement. Your prepared statements will be made part of the record.

I'll remind our members that we will use our customary five-minute rule today for questioning, proceeding by full committee seniority and arrival time.

[Unanimous Consent (if needed)].

With that, let me turn it over to the Chair of the Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities, Mr. Smith, for his opening statement.

Statement of Terrorism, Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee Chairman Adam Smith

Joint Hearing with the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee on "Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations: Approaches to Interagency Integration"

February 26, 2008

"Good afternoon. I want to thank our panelists for joining us today to discuss irregular warfare and stability operations and how we can improve interagency coordination and integration.

"The terrorism subcommittee is glad to be working together today with Dr. Snyder's subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, and I look forward to hearing his insights and well as those of the panelists today.

"The nature of twenty-first century conflicts requires us to emphasize a range of so-called "irregular warfare" operations – from stabilization and reconstruction efforts to counterinsurgency missions – along with more conventional combat operations. Key to those efforts is the work of our government's interagency partners. With DoD set to define stability operations under the larger umbrella of irregular warfare, it will be more important than ever for interagency organizations like U.S. Special Operations Command to be integrated into every level of irregular warfare planning and execution.

"Today, we hope to hear from witnesses more about the department's upcoming directive regarding irregular warfare, how it will integrate interagency participation, and how strategic communication can be improved and utilized to help combat insurgencies and stabilize regions in which our troops operate.

"Again, I appreciate the willingness of our two panels of witnesses to make time in their busy schedules for today's hearing."

Statement of Ranking Member Todd Akin
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
House Armed Services Committee

Hearing on Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations:
Approaches to Interagency Integration

February 26, 2008

Thank you, Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith and Ranking Member Thornberry. Good afternoon to our witnesses, we appreciate you being here today.

After studying Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) and the subject of interagency stability operations for over four months, Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee is ready to close out this investigation. Today's hearing offers an opportunity to hear from administration witnesses and military commanders on how we are learning from the PRT program in Iraq and Afghanistan as we plan and execute future stability operations across the interagency.

This joint hearing with the Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee offers an opportunity to assess how the Department of Defense is generating and integrating stability operations competencies across the services and in the Department with other non-traditional, unconventional capabilities. In particular, I'm interested in following up on Secretary Vickers' testimony on how the new Irregular Warfare directive appropriately prioritizes stability operations compared to the previous directive, and takes into account what interagency partners are doing in the arena of stability operations.

Again, thank you to our witnesses for being here today. I look forward to your testimony.

February 26, 2008

Opening Statement of Ranking Member Mac Thornberry

Joint Subcommittee Hearing on Irregular Warfare & Stability Operations: Approaches to Interagency Integration

"Thank you Mr. Chairman. You also won't hear in the presidential debates that this is an issue that Republicans and Democrats, at least on these two subcommittees, strongly agree upon.

"This is a very important matter with a sense of urgency. And, I think that all of us who have talked with folks coming back from Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as a fair number of people within the Beltway, share that sense of urgency that something must be done to help this government be more effective at the kinds of things we are talking about today.

"I appreciate you being here and look forward to your statements."

###

STATEMENT OF
ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR SO/LIC&IC
MICHAEL VICKERS

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2008

Good afternoon, Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Akin, Ranking Member Thornberry, and members of the subcommittees. I am pleased to be here today to discuss the Department's progress in developing capabilities and capacities for irregular warfare and stability operations, and in integrating these capabilities with those of other U.S. Government departments and agencies. Both the Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff highlighted the need to improve joint force and interagency proficiency in these areas when they testified before the House Armed Services Committee earlier this month.

Today and for decades to come, the United States and our international partners must contend with terrorism with a global reach; rogue regimes that provide support to terrorists and seek to acquire weapons of mass destruction; threats emerging in and emanating from fragile states and poorly governed areas; and new manifestations of ethnic, tribal, and sectarian conflict. This range of irregular warfare challenges blurs the line between peace and war. Indeed, many of these threats come from countries with which the United States is not at war, and manifest themselves in ways that cannot be overcome solely by military means. The responses they demand extend well beyond the traditional domain of any single government agency or department. As the U.S. Government wrestles with how to transform itself in order to address these threats, the Department continues to do its part by implementing the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review's vision to develop concepts and capabilities to address irregular challenges.

Irregular Warfare (IW) and Stability Operations Capabilities

It is my responsibility as ASD (SO/LIC&IC) to implement the vision provided in the QDR across all of the Department's warfighting capabilities while providing policy oversight over their employment. The QDR established that irregular warfare is as strategically important as traditional warfare. As a result, it was incorporated into the Department's force planning construct, influencing the size of the force as well as the types of capabilities needed.

Irregular warfare activities conducted by the joint force include a variety of operations and activities to prevent and respond to the challenges outlined above. These missions include, but are not limited to: counterterrorism (CT); unconventional warfare (UW); foreign internal defense (FID); counterinsurgency (COIN); and stability operations, which, in the context of IW, involve establishing or re-establishing order in a fragile state. Irregular warfare operations may occur independently of, or in combination with, traditional warfare campaigns. None of these IW missions is new to the Department of Defense. Many of the capabilities required to execute them are resident in some parts of our force, but not with sufficient capacity to meet expected demand. In other cases, we need to develop new capabilities to address emerging challenges.

Rebalancing the overall Defense portfolio to ensure that the joint force is as effective in irregular warfare as it is in traditional warfare requires focused efforts in three key areas: growing special operations forces (SOF) capacity, while maintaining quality standards; reorienting general purpose force (GPF) capabilities toward irregular warfare while maintaining the capability of GPF to prevail in traditional campaigns; and promoting increased integration between SOF and GPF.

To date, the Department of Defense has taken significant strides toward achieving lasting institutional change. It has invested in SOF growth; produced a Joint Operating Concept for Irregular Warfare; launched a capability-based assessment process to identify the optimum force structure and capabilities to support IW missions; and completed a comprehensive review of the capability and capacity demands for GPF to conduct long-duration counterinsurgency operations, and to train, equip, and advise operationally significant foreign security forces in multiple theaters of operation. The Department has also incorporated IW concepts into plans, strategic guidance, and the analytic agenda.

An important complementary effort within the Department is implementing the DoD Directive on *Military Support to SSTR* (3000.05). As members of these subcommittees know, this directive set policy to adapt DoD processes and develop capabilities for planning, training, and preparing to conduct and support U.S. Government stabilization and reconstruction efforts. In particular, the Department is emphasizing improved civil-military integration for future stabilization operations. Institutionalizing the lessons of OEF and OIF – e.g., enhancing Provincial Reconstruction Teams and pursuing information sharing capabilities to improve our ability to share knowledge with our interagency, multinational, and private sector partners – remains a high priority within the Department.

We continue to build on the transformational concepts to enhance joint force irregular warfare capabilities. For example, Deputy Secretary England recently initiated a Department-wide review of the capabilities required to "Train, Advise, Assist" (TAA) foreign security forces. This effort, while still at a preliminary stage, builds on the findings of various joint assessments that have concluded that training foreign security forces will be an enduring mission for both SOF and GPF. As this effort continues, we are focusing on key questions regarding the types and echelons of foreign security forces that the joint force should be prepared to train or advise; appropriate operating concepts for whole-of-government foreign security force assistance; the roles and capabilities of all elements of the U.S. Government to achieve these missions; and what gaps in capability, capacity, resources, and authorities exist.

Experiences in OIF and OEF have shown that joint force transformation, as directed by the 2006 QDR, is on the right path. GPF have demonstrated the agility to train and advise foreign security forces at the tactical and operational level. This expanded GPF role in advising foreign forces has enabled SOF to devote more capabilities to its unique mission set – e.g., CT, training and advising foreign SOF, and UW. We continue to seek better SOF-GPF integration and force allocation methods that contribute to our GWOT strategic objectives. These efforts exemplify our strategy of increasing security by working with and through key partners, and by enhancing the capacity of our partners to defeat terrorist threats.

These transformational initiatives will soon be reflected in the Department's force development planning and resource priorities. Strategic guidance will direct further examination of IW steady-state and surge requirements across the full range of IW scenarios. This effort will build on lessons learned from OEF and OIF, particularly in CT-, UW-, and COIN-related mission sets. The guidance will identify aspects of the defense capability portfolio where we can accept some risk in order to increase investment in areas where the joint force is less proficient – including irregular warfare and stability operations.

Finally, we are in the early stages of developing a DoD directive that takes a comprehensive view of irregular warfare concepts and requirements. This broader view goes beyond post-conflict stabilization and reconstruction -- it encompasses capabilities and operating concepts to address the preventive elements of the strategy to reduce irregular security challenges. In so doing, we will reinforce the QDR vision that IW capabilities be accorded priority comparable to traditional warfare capabilities – from the tools required to conduct steady-state CT operations to those required to conduct large-scale COIN and stabilization operations.

This comprehensive approach recognizes the synergy of employing common capabilities across a variety of environments. The skill sets that apply in stability operations – e.g., cross-cultural communications and language skills, enhanced intelligence through the use of social science expertise, indirect approaches, etc. – also apply to the broad suite of IW missions: FID, CT, UW, and COIN. The Department's leadership believes this approach will facilitate more efficient use of DoD resources for training and educating personnel, and in identifying and fielding required capabilities. It should also drive the development of a robust cadre of expert military and DoD civilian career professionals who concentrate on irregular warfare mission areas throughout their careers. Our efforts to streamline internal DoD processes and capability development will enhance our ability to support whole-of-government efforts with improved capabilities and enhanced joint force capacity.

Interagency Integration

Many of today's most pressing security challenges can emerge from within countries with which we are not at war. We face adversaries who are dispersed, stateless, and capable of inflicting damage globally. Ultimately, success in overcoming these adversaries lies in sustained support from indigenous populations for their legitimate governments. Helping our partners to meet the needs of their people in a responsible way requires a whole-of-government approach at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels.

The Department supports the interagency planning efforts of the National Counterterrorism Center, which seeks to coordinate, integrate, and synchronize the employment of diplomatic, financial, intelligence, military, and law enforcement instruments of national power. Today's security environment not only requires focused interagency efforts to build partner capability to prevent exploitation of weak or failing states, but it also requires creative interagency approaches to defeat the most immediate threats to security.

For example, in Iraq, DoD is working with the Department of Treasury and other government agencies to undermine financial support for the insurgency through the Iraq Threat Finance Cell (ITFC). The ITFC was established to enhance the collection, analysis and dissemination of intelligence to support and strengthen U.S., Iraqi, and Coalition efforts to disrupt and eliminate key terrorist and insurgent financial network nodes.

Defeating threats can also include intelligence and kinetic capabilities to act in support of or on behalf of international partners in eliminating the most dangerous threats. In many cases these cooperative endeavors contribute toward creating the time and space needed for our partners to strengthen their capabilities to address

security challenges independently. In a separate venue, I would be happy to provide additional detail regarding the progress we have seen in our partnerships with the intelligence community to increase our effectiveness for these activities.

The "Global Train and Equip" authority provides commanders a means to fill longstanding gaps in our ability to build the capacity and capabilities of partner nations to address irregular challenges. The program focuses on places where we are not at war, but where there are emerging threats and opportunities. Our commanders consider this a vital tool in the war on terror, and it is a model of interagency cooperation between the Departments of State and Defense. This authority is executed under joint DoD and State Department procedures, requiring approval of proposals by Combatant Commanders and Embassies in the field, and both the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State in Washington. I hope the members of these subcommittees also recognize the importance of this tool and will work with their colleagues in Congress to extend this authority and expand it to meet COCOM and Embassy needs.

On numerous occasions, Secretary Gates has supported proposals that increase resources for civilian agencies. A key complement to the Global Train and Equip authority is the "Section 1207" Security and Stabilization Assistance authority, which provides the U.S. Government greater flexibility to bring the right civilian expertise from across the interagency to bear alongside, or instead of, the joint force. This authority provides the State Department additional resources for rapid execution of programs to seize opportunities and mitigate emerging threats. Like the Global Train and Equip authority, 1207 is operated under "dual key" procedures. I appreciate your support for this authority.

DoD also supports the Civilian Stabilization Initiative (CSI), a $249M program in the State Department's FY09 budget request, which answers the President's call to improve the United States' ability to respond to instability and conflict. To realize fully the capabilities of CSI, the Department supports passage of H.R. 1084, the Civilian Stabilization and Reconstruction Management Act of 2007.

The Department continues to support the work of the State Department's Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) in implementation of National Security Presidential Directive – 44 (NSPD-44), which provides the framework to guide civilian capability development for stabilization and reconstruction operations and the integration of those capabilities with those of the joint force. DoD has developed a plan that outlines critical DoD activities in support of NSPD-44, based on the guiding principle that DoD capabilities and expertise will be employed to enhance whole-of-government approaches and civilian agency capacities for stabilization and reconstruction. DoD remains engaged in the development of shared training and education programs and the on-

going work to produce a U.S. Government Planning Framework for Reconstruction and Stabilization.

Strategic Communication

Strategic communication is another critical component of interagency efforts to address the range of 21st-century security challenges. As we support our partners' efforts to meet the needs of their people in a responsible way, we simultaneously seek to erode support for terrorists and insurgents. Successful efforts to counter ideological support to terrorism (CIST) must focus on the self-perceptions and self-interests of key audiences, rather than their perceptions of the United States. Its narrative must outline an alternative future – a future of hope and opportunity that is more attractive than the oppressive future offered by violent extremists. The positive narrative that explains these differences must contain more than just anti-extremist rhetoric. It must include elements that affect the lives of the population – fairness, justice, opportunity, liberty, health, education, hope, and, foremost, security.

Effective strategic communication in this arena requires more than just a compelling narrative – it requires taking actions that make our words credible. From a DoD perspective, such actions can range from building the capability of partner security forces to establishing a safe and secure environment and providing essential governmental services until appropriate civilian authorities can do so. The Department, collaborating with interagency partners, must improve its capabilities for these IW missions in order to match our words with action.

Conclusion

The Department of Defense continues to adapt our organizations and processes to meet contemporary security challenges. Key among these are invigorated capabilities for irregular warfare operations: CT, UW, FID, COIN, and Stability Operations. This Department recognizes that defending against ideologically-driven extremists requires synergistic effort from the entire U.S. Government, and active assistance from our key international partners. The QDR vision provides a viable roadmap for this Department to perform its mission in concert with our partners. With your continued support, we will continue to exercise the agility needed to strengthen these partnerships in ways that preserve and protect the values and interests of our Nation.

PREPARED STATEMENT

AMBASSADOR JOHN HERBST
COORDINATOR FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEES ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS AND TERRORISM & UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

FEBRUARY 26, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Snyder and Chairman Smith, Ranking Members Akin and Thornberry, and Members of both Subcommittees, thank you for the opportunity to testify today on the role of the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization and our interagency partners in working with the Department of Defense specifically with respect to this subcommittee's interest in developing and updating practices for stability operations, particularly with respect to the concept of irregular warfare.

As my colleague from DOD has noted, today we face complex threats to United States national interests and security from a range of states and non-state actors, many of regional or even global reach, who seek to perpetrate acts of terrorism, criminality and to incite internal and regional instability. Fragile states and poorly governed areas can become breeding grounds for terrorism, weapons proliferation, trafficking in humans and narcotics, organized crime, and humanitarian catastrophes. These complex challenges for the United States and our international partners require a comprehensive government planning and operational response that weaves together a spectrum of capabilities in counter-insurgency, counterterrorism, stability operations, with the full complement of civilian skills and approaches in stabilizing and reconstructing failed states; preventing conflict; and tackling terrorist financing, organized crime, and the illegal arms trade.

We face a shifting, dynamic and demanding world that will test our national capabilities, constantly requiring new approaches, new coalitions, and the best practices we can learn and impart to our men and women working in the field. As a nation we must have tools that are highly flexible and capable in a range of situations. The steps to successfully meeting this challenge on the civilian side are not unlike how the military prepares as well: build the necessary human capacity, develop planning and management systems, train these experts in the necessary skills and in the situations they will likely encounter, and repeatedly exercise with partners until our people are ready. At the center of this preparation is the effort to strengthen the partnership within the U.S. government between civilians and the military, so that as these threats evolve, and possibly rise to the level of military engagement, we have the relationships and systems in place to respond effectively.

National Security Presidential Directive 44 (NSPD-44) recognizes his challenge in the area of stabilization and reconstruction and calls on both civilian and military elements of the federal government to promote the security of the United States through improved coordination, planning, and implementation. NSPD-44 makes the Secretary of State responsible for integrating U.S. efforts to prepare, plan for, and conduct these reconstruction and stabilization activities, and calls on the Secretaries of State and Defense to harmonize civilian and military efforts so that civilians are planning and operating with the military before and during the start up of any operation.

The DOD Directive on Military Support to Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) Operations (3000.05) supports NSPD-44. We've worked closely with DOD to synchronize transformation under DO Directive 3000.05 with NSPD 44 implementation. Intensive DOD involvement has been critical in the two year process we have just completed to identify the civilian capacity that is needed going forward.

Our work in NSPD-44 implementation rests in a context of a much larger process to continually build a ready, seamless civilian-military partnership on which Ambassador Mull, Assistant-Secretary of State for Political-Military Affairs recently submitted testimony. In this submission, he covered a wealth of activities that his bureau leads for the Department of State in building this partnership: in State-DOD policy coordination, personnel exchanges, use of Political Advisors (POLADs), and executing over five billion dollars in U.S. foreign military assistance. I will focus today on the efforts that my office has been leading to ensure that the civilian interagency is prepared, equipped, and trained to partner with the military in stabilization and reconstruction planning and operations.

Since S/CRS was established in 2004 we have built a modest and promising rapid response capability within the State Department and a growing cadre of civilian planners in our office of 80 experts. We are an interagency office with detailees over the past three years from USAID; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; the Departments of Defense, Treasury, Justice, Homeland Security, and Labor; the Intelligence Community; and other parts of the State Department. Our team is currently providing planning, operations or assessment assistance in Afghanistan, Sudan, Haiti, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Kosovo, and Liberia. We also have an officer detailed to AFRICOM and another to SOUTHCOM, and we have increasingly stronger relationships with a number of the combatant commands.

Over the last two years, we have piloted new concepts and engaged in important planning and operations. For example, we opened the U.S. office in Darfur's capital of El Fasher, helped coordinate assistance on the ground in Lebanon for the Ambassador there, and sent teams to Afghanistan to facilitate planning with Provincial Reconstruction Teams. Pilot engagements such as these have proven the value of our approach. It is now time to expand our efforts. The civilian agencies need to have a robust capability to take on these challenges in a significant way so that armed forces do not have to intervene and where military engagement is needed in stabilization crises, to be a true partner to the military. This requires an innovative change in the way the U.S. Government approaches and resources conflict response. Just as the military underwent tremendous reform in the 1980s following the passage of the Goldwater-Nichols Act, we are proposing shifts across our civilian agencies that will bring all elements of national power to bear in the defense of America's vital interests.

BUILDING CIVILIAN CAPACITY FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND STABILIZATION

Over the last year, we have been working together across 15 civilian and military agencies to answer President Bush's 2005 call in NSPD-44 to significantly improve the management of U.S. Government reconstruction and stabilization operations. This unprecedented process has brought together experts from the NSC staff, DOD, USAID, State, Justice, Agriculture, Commerce, Treasury, Transportation, Energy, Homeland Security, Health and Human Services, OMB, OPM, and the Intelligence Community to sit together and determine in detail the U.S. civilian capacity needed to succeed in a stabilization operation. It has required an extraordinary commitment of staff and expertise that has also benefited from extraordinary support from Members of Congress and outside experts, including the academic community.

This group examined U.S. responses in Afghanistan, Iraq, Bosnia, Kosovo, Haiti, East Timor, and Lebanon and looked at a range of possible future countries at risk to identify the range and number of civilians required to meet the need. This examination identified three required levels of deployable expert civilians: an Active Response Corps of up to 250 first responders from civilian federal agencies, a Standby Response Corps of up to 2000 other government officials, and a Civilian Reserve Corps drawn from private sector experts and state and local government officials from across the United States. The President embraced this recommendation, and confirmed his support yet again when early this month he presented to Congress the Civilian Stabilization Initiative in his FY 2009 budget.

The Civilian Stabilization Initiative, as outlined in the President's budget request, will provide a full complement of U.S. civilian personnel that can respond quickly and flexibly to stabilization challenges. It provides for new positions within State, USAID and in other partner agencies devoted to increasing civilian reconstruction and stabilization (R&S) expertise, and it strengthens the ability of our civilians and military to work together on this complex challenge. The experts within the Active, Standby and Civilian Reserve Corps will also provide the civilian partner our armed forces need to convert military success into longer-term stability in R&S missions. Within 48 hours after a crisis erupts, CSI will allow us to deploy, for example, rule of law (including law enforcement) experts from State and Justice, economic experts from Commerce and Treasury, border security experts from Homeland Security, and governance, infrastructure, and conflict recovery officers from USAID, according to a unified plan.

The proposed CSI Active and Standby Response Corps will be supplemented, as needed, by the Civilian Reserve Corps. With trained and equipped Civilian Reserve personnel on call, we will be able to deploy experts drawn from the private sector and state and local government from across the country with the necessary specialties and training – such as police officers, judicial advisors, agronomists, and city managers -- within 30 days. This capacity will allow the high-level of flexibility and agility necessary to meet the needs of these complex missions.

COMPREHENSIVE GOVERNMENT PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEM FOR R&S OPERATIONS

The Civilian Stabilization Initiative is the critical first step to ensure we have the right people, with the right skills, at the right time. However, making sure that these experts are doing the right things, synchronized between civilian and the military leadership on the ground (when the military is engaged), according to <u>one</u> strategic plan continues to be the most complex and challenging task of NSPD-44. In response to this challenge, the Interagency Management System (IMS) was developed and the Interagency Reconstruction and Stabilization planning framework has been revised; feats that could not have happened without the full commitment and participation of the 15 agencies involved, including participants from throughout DOD.

The principal value of the IMS is that it creates unity of purpose through an agreed comprehensive government planning and management process, translating that purpose into unified effort through integrated operations in the field. It clarifies roles, responsibilities, and processes for interagency R&S planning and operations. The IMS is scaleable to the situation and integrates personnel from all relevant agencies. This system is designed for highly complex crises and operations. However, it is

important to note that it is not intended to respond to the political and humanitarian situations that are regularly and effectively handled through current organizations and systems. The IMS is designed to operate in the context of other multinational partners' activities and efforts and to provide a command and control structure for stabilization operations that would oversee all civilian activities including contracting. It would avoid duplication of effort and facilitate oversight of all civilian expenditure.

DOD was a full partner in the development of both of these systems and, as part of its implementation of NSPD-44 and DOD Directive 3000.05, has provided talented staff, civilian and uniformed, to help hone the concepts from their original theory to everyday practice. We have applied the interagency planning framework or its principles in U.S. Government efforts in Afghanistan, Haiti, Kosovo, and Sudan.

ACHIEVING A NEW LEVEL OF READINESS THROUGH TRAINING

It is clear, as we prepare for this complex environment, that we have much to learn about training our civilians to be ready for the range of issues they will confront. We need to draw from various sources of expertise in training, including DOD. To fulfill the President's Directive and team with DOD on their efforts with DOD Directive 3000.05, S/CRS established a training working group bringing together representatives from the State Department, USAID, Defense, Justice, Commerce, USDA, HHS, DHS, Treasury, and the U.S. Institute of Peace. This group fosters collaboration among participating agencies to develop the training necessary to prepare officers for reconstruction and stabilization operations. The training working group is building on and leveraging existing resources. It is therefore connected with the National Security Education Consortium, the Security, Stabilization, Transition, and Reconstruction Senior Leaders Roundtable activities, and many other interagency training venues. This effort supports the President's May 2007 Executive Order on National Security Professional Development.

To better prepare those engaged in R&S issues, S/CRS has an increasingly robust training program with the State Department's Foreign Service Institute. S/CRS, PM and interagency partner staff regularly provide expertise to the National Defense University and the Army, Navy and Air War Colleges to prepare a wide range of personnel from PRT staff to senior level staff from across the U.S. Government. We have a close relationship with a number of U.S. military professional education institutions and collaborate to ensure NSPD-44 concepts and processes are built in to their curricula.

In addition to these institutional training processes, we regularly partner with our military colleagues for training that builds relationships between civilians and military in the field and practices the type of interagency collaboration that is so essential to effectiveness in the R&S environment. My staff and USAID colleagues regularly participate in the U.S. Army's Certain Trust exercise and training series at Ft. Bragg, which is the culminating exercise of the Civil Affairs officer course. Working with USAID's Office of Military Affairs, we recently completed training for the Provincial Reconstruction Teams currently headed out to Afghanistan.

As we look to move forward with the Civilian Stabilization Initiative, these types of training that build relationships between civilian and military colleagues, teach common planning and

assessment practices, and expose our personnel to the methods, mechanisms and processes of the other agencies before facing the demands of the mission itself, will be critical to success.

PREPARING WITH INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS AND DOD THROUGH EXERCISES

We have already been partnering with other civilian agencies, the military and international partners to test the Interagency Management System, working out planning, systems and potential challenges in the exercise environment, so that we will be ready to respond effectively when the next crisis erupts.

An interagency Military Activities Review Team directs this process and works closely with DOD in the effort to engage civilian agencies more effectively in military experiments and exercises. The main focal points for R&S exercises are Unified Action (UA) 2007-2008 and Multinational Experiment 5. UA 2007-2008 is a civilian-led experiment conducted in support of the NSPD-44 implementation process, focusing on refining interagency conflict assessment and interagency planning at the strategic and operational levels. S/CRS is also coordinating interagency input into the Multinational Experiment 5 experiment series, led by U.S. Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) which includes participation by civilian and military actors.

In addition, there are a growing number of exercises with Geographic Combatant Commands which focus on using the IMS and exercise the integration of civilian activities into the scenario. Currently almost half my staff are engaged in an exercise with SOUTHCOM which is practicing using the three levels of the IMS in a highly complex mission. Eighty-four interagency personnel from more than twenty offices across the U.S. Government are involved. This is the third year of this exercise and each time we gain invaluable insight that has improved and strengthened the system and built a strong partnership with SOUTHCOM. We will observe a major PACOM exercise later this year.

These exercises have allowed us to practice and build relationships not only with the U.S. military but with a range of international partners who may be essential to the success of future operations. Building civilian capacity for R&S is not just a U.S. priority. We share a commitment with our international partners to prevent states from failing and to resolve both the causes and the consequences of violent conflict. From the beginning, S/CRS has worked closely with USAID, PM, and DOD to build close working relationships with international partner organizations ranging from the United Nations, to NATO and the European Union, and partner countries like the United Kingdom and Canada. We are also reaching out to other countries such as Australia, France, Germany, Japan and South Korea. Our work with these international partners has spanned both collaboration on civilian activities and understanding how civilians and militaries can plan and operate together more effectively.

A good example of our multifaceted international engagement can be found in our collaboration with JFCOM on the Multinational Experiment (MNE) series, which aims to improve civil-military cooperation among international partners in a crisis. MNE-4, held in March 2006, brought together eight countries and NATO, with the UN and EU observing. The next iteration (MNE-5) is now underway. Through such multilateral exercises, and through bilateral efforts, S/CRS consistently strives to increase global capacity to deal with the threats posed by failed or

failing states, as well as with the human causes and consequences of conflict. We do this by developing and sharing tools with partners to help ensure we can work together more effectively and efficiently on the ground in a conflict environment.

One of the areas of focus is strategic communications. This has been highlighted again and again as a critical area for R&S planning and operations. The Interagency Management system includes a multi-level approach to ensure the U.S. effort has a common strategic communications strategy and approach. We are linking this strategic communications effort throughout all levels of the mission and weaving strategic communications capacity, resources, and messages throughout the planning process in a feedback loop that ensures our efforts are appropriate and effective for the people in the countries in most need of our help.

CONCLUSION

There is no doubt that failing states and ungoverned territories can quickly spawn threats to the security of our nation, its citizens and interests, and our allies and partners. The nature of these threats, their complexity and lethality are constantly evolving. As DOD develops its capacity to meet these threats militarily across a range of complex scenarios, we must continue our intensive efforts on the civilian side to strengthen our capacity to be an effective partner going forward, particularly in missions where an early civilian lead may avoid military intervention entirely. We cannot continue to make do with a resource imbalance that leaves the Pentagon as the default for undertaking sustained, large-scale reconstruction and stabilization missions. Civilians must increase the capacity to effectively engage. This is true not only because most of the critical R&S tasks are civilian in nature and require a civilian lead, but also due to the burden placed on our armed forces, which detracts from our overall military readiness.

Building the U.S. civilian planning and operations capacity embodied in the Civilian Stabilization Initiative will ensure that we are able to partner with the military when necessary for the challenges that lie ahead and to deal with some crises without having to invoke U.S. military power. Continually improving and expanding our joint training and exercises will help us ensure this new capacity is truly ready for what lies ahead. In the end, the effort we make – and the expenses we incur – to develop a strong, fast U.S. civilian response capability will reduce the cost we ultimately pay, both in dollars and in lives, to manage the national security dangers arising from failed and destabilized states.

Thank you.

###

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY until released by the House Committee on Armed Services

STATEMENT OF

REAR ADMIRAL DAN DAVENPORT, USN
DIRECTOR, JOINT CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT AND EXPERIMENTATION DIRECTORATE
UNITED STATES JOINT FORCES COMMAND

BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

26 FEBRUARY 2008

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY until released by the House Committee on Armed Services

Statement of

Rear Admiral Dan Davenport, USN
Director, Joint Concept Development and
Experimentation Directorate
United States Joint Forces Command

Before the House Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations
Subcommittee on Terrorism and Unconventional Threats and Capabilities

26 February 2008

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, on behalf of General Mattis, Commander, United States Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM), thank you for allowing me to appear before you today. My testimony will address JFCOM's role in developing Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations concepts and joint doctrine, and JFCOM's role in improving interagency integration at all levels of irregular warfare and stabilization planning and operations. We appreciate the continued support of this subcommittee and the United States Congress in this regard.

JFCOM has been actively engaged in improving interagency integration with military planning and execution for Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations. Guided by the clear direction in the DOD Work Plan to Support NSPD-44 Implementation, DOD Directive 3000.05 and the Building Partnership Capacity QDR execution roadmap, JFCOM is supporting the overall DOD effort to improve interagency integration at the operational level. We believe our efforts at JFCOM in doctrine, concept development, experimentation, and exercises continue to make significant contributions to our joint force ability to execute irregular warfare and stability operations and to integrate the interagency throughout. I would like to describe these activities in more detail to you.

Doctrine

JFCOM is charged to assist the CJCS with Joint Doctrine development. The development process is collaborative and follows the natural maturation of new ideas or concepts. It starts with the development of white papers and pamphlets to generate robust discussion and leads to the ultimate issuance of new doctrinal documents. Our approach to Joint Doctrine Development includes analysis of approved joint concepts and experimentation results to determine their potential impact on existing joint doctrine, assessment of joint doctrine to identify doctrinal voids, and evaluation of draft Joint doctrine for accuracy and relevancy. These efforts in doctrine development are continually informed by lessons learned and best practices from the current theaters of war and ongoing operations and exercises. Current publications dealing with civilian-military cooperation and the interagency community across the spectrum of conflict, including Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations, include:

- **Joint Publication 3-08** *Interagency, Intergovernmental Organization, and Nongovernmental Organization Coordination During Joint Operations.* This comprehensive document provides the Joint Force Commander with an authoritative source for dealing with non-military organizations in the course of their operations. Its two volumes address the central idea that *"The integration of US political and military objectives and the subsequent translation of these objectives into action have always been essential to success at all levels of operation."*

- **Joint Publication 3-57** *Civil-Military Operations.* This publication provides guidance to a Joint Force Commander regarding the specific civil-military mission. From the Executive Summary: *"Civil-military operations (CMO) encompass the activities that*

joint force commanders (JFCs) take to establish and maintain positive relations between their forces, the civil authorities, and the general population, resources, and institutions in friendly, neutral, or hostile areas where their forces are employed in order to facilitate military operations and to consolidate and achieve US objectives."

- *White Paper No. 07-01, Provincial Reconstruction Teams.* This pre-doctrinal research paper was published in November of 2007 as a result of JFCOM's review of lessons learned and best practices to determine if the PRT concept was sufficiently mature for establishment in Joint Doctrine. It describes operational planning considerations for PRT organization, employment and command and control. As a result of this research paper, JFCOM has submitted recommendations to the Joint Staff for the revision of JP 3-57, including proposed PRT definitions, planning considerations and vignette's describing PRT operations in Afghanistan and comparing/contrasting OEF and OIF PRTs.

- *Commander's Handbook for the Joint Interagency Coordination Group.* Published in March 2007, this pre-doctrinal handbook serves as a bridge between the evolving JIACG and its migration into doctrine. As such, it is intended to inform Joint Force Commanders, new JIACG staff members, interagency partners, doctrine writers, educators, and trainers about the JIACG and its potential for further inclusion in joint doctrine, education, and training. It also presents well developed definitions that have been harmonized with current and evolving joint doctrine and discusses those "best practices" that have proven of value during on-going military operations, exercises, and experimentation.

Joint doctrine provides guidance for the Joint Force Commander and a foundation for operations and training. Additionally, it serves as a basis from which further operational or organizational spiral improvements can be made. It is apparent that SOUTCOM has used

JFCOM analysis and products to help build their IA integration capacity. And the experience of SOUTHCOM is providing valuable lessons learned and best practices that are being used to assist in the development of the integrated AFRICOM civilian and military staff. Furthermore, future doctrine development will be informed by JFCOM's work on the Irregular Warfare and the Stabilization, Security, Transition and Reconstruction Operations Joint Operating Concepts.

Concepts

The intellectual underpinning of JFCOM's interagency advocacy resides in the Joint Operating Concepts. The Joint Operating Concepts are developed in coordination with the Joint Staff, the combatant commands and the services. They are tested through rigorous experimentation. Concept development seeks to address gaps in current capabilities and provides a foundation for developing solutions in the future operating environment.

Among the joint concepts, broad interagency integration plays a key role as noted below:

- *Capstone Concept for Joint Operations* (CCJO) focuses on a strategy for achieving military objectives while contributing to broader national objectives through unified action--integration with other interagency and multinational partners. *"A significant premise of this concept involves integrating the actions of the joint force with those of interagency and multinational partners to achieve broader national objectives."* The principles of Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations are included in the CCJO. JFCOM has recently been charged with revising this document.

- *Military Support to Stabilization, Security, Transition and Reconstruction Operations* (SSTRO JOC) addresses military support to the full range of security, stabilization, transition, and post conflict reconstruction activities. *"US military efforts in SSTR operations will be*

focused on effectively combining the efforts of the U.S. and coalition militaries with those of USG agencies and multi-national partners to provide direct assistance to stabilize the situation and build self-sufficient host nation capability and capacity in several key areas..."

- Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept (IW JOC) JFCOM supported SOCOM in the development of this concept which posits seamless interaction between civilian and military elements of national power across the spectrum of conflict. *"Irregular warfare favors indirect approaches [that] employ the full range of military and other capabilities to seek asymmetric advantages, in order to erode an adversary's power, influence and will."*

- Draft Military Support to Cooperative Security, (CS JOC) focuses on how the Joint Force Commander contributes to fostering a security environment favorable to U.S. interests as well as establishing a base for effective crisis response. It addresses the full range of military support to a comprehensive, whole of government approach. *"CS is defined as the set of continuous, long-term integrated, comprehensive actions among a broad spectrum of U.S. and international governmental and non-governmental partners that maintains or enhances stability, prevents or mitigates crises, and enables other operations when crises occur."*

Experimentation

JFCOM maintains a vigorous experimentation slate to examine and validate concepts and capabilities. Capabilities may span the full range of doctrine, organization, training, materiel, logistics, planning, facilities, and policy activities necessary to provide a fully functional capability. Interagency integration has been a major focus for experimentation across the range of available venues including:

- Concept/Capability Development and Validation: Seminars, wargames and limited objective experiments subject concepts and potential solutions to rigorous examination and validation. These venues may include advanced modeling and simulation as part of the analysis.

Interagency integration has been a focus of Joint experimentation since 2000 when the results of the Rapid Decisive Operations (RDO) 2000 exercise highlighted it as a significant planning and execution deficiency. Current major experimental efforts designed to address the tools, processes and organizational structure to improve interagency coordination include:

- Unified Action: In coordination with OSD (Policy) and the Joint Staff, JFCOM is working closely with interagency partners to operationalize NSPD-44 by supporting the State Department Office of the Coordinator for Stabilization and Reconstruction (S/CRS) to refine and experiment with USG Planning Framework and Interagency Management System. Products from this experiment will include pre-doctrinal sectoral handbooks for use by the Joint Force Commander during the entire range of military operations to support Security Sector Reform, Rule of Law and Governance, Economic Development and Maintenance of Essential Services and Critical Infrastructure.

- Multi-National Experiment 5: JFCOM, seventeen partner nations and NATO are conducting this experimental campaign on the comprehensive approach to coalition operations. The goal is to develop a civil-military framework for coalition response in stability and reconstruction operations. At the conclusion of MNE 5 we expect to have collaborative solutions for the military commander to integrate military planning and execution with coalition partner's civilian agencies and militaries, and international and non-governmental organizations. These solutions will have been developed with our international

partners in concert with their own national objectives for experimentation on the comprehensive approach.

- Noble Resolve: JFCOM is providing experimentation support for NORTHCOM to increase their capability to support Homeland Defense, Homeland Security, and Defense Support to Civil Authorities in close cooperation with interagency partners. Primarily focused on information sharing, with special emphasis on development of an interagency common operating picture (COP), our key experimental partners include NORTHCOM, DHS, the National Guard Bureau and FEMA.

- Joint Urban Operations (JUO): As the DOD Executive Agent for JUO, JFCOM has been directed by SECDEF to "lead, coordinate, and integrate the urban operations doctrine, organization, training and equipment activities of DOD components to improve and transform the capabilities of joint forces for conducting urban operations over the full range of urban contingencies." In this line of experimentation JFCOM is working with interagency partners in seeking to improve key Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance and multi-national capabilities in the urban environment to include communicating effectively, gathering information and developing actionable intelligence in a timely manner in support of joint and multinational operations.

- Irregular Warfare Capabilities Based Assessment (IW CBA): JFCOM is supporting SOCOM in an effort to determine and refine the capabilities necessary to conduct Irregular Warfare Operations as described in the Joint Operating Concept. The assessment, including a series of Limited Objective Experiments (LOE), is based on the central idea of the JOC, that seamless interaction between civilian and military elements of national power across the

spectrum of conflict is necessary to meet the wide range of challenges in Irregular warfare. Interagency and multinational partners have participated in a recent IW CBA wargame.

- Field experimentation: JFCOM supported SOUTHCOM in testing the validity of a long-term JIACG prototype, functioning outside the bounds of a particular experimental or exercise environment. JFCOM is assisting AFRICOM in a comprehensive interagency mission analysis supporting their expanded interagency structure within the command.

- Current Operations: Current operations and the innovations being made by operational forces inform JFCOM's work in training, doctrine development, operational analysis and experimentation. JFCOM is currently supporting operations in Iraq, Afghanistan and Djibouti through direct operational and planning support, lessons learned studies, and limited experimentation. Lessons and best practices gathered from these operations directly feed doctrine and concept development and experimentation, as well pre-deployment training for designated service headquarters that will assume MNC-I, CJTF-82 and CJTF Horn of Africa missions.

Exercises & Training

Joint Force training is constantly adjusted to reflect most recent lessons learned, best practices and doctrine. The inclusion of interagency partners in the context of combatant command and Joint Task Force exercises and training is central to JFCOM's training mission. COCOM exercises incorporate training and spiral capability improvements to ensure forces going forward are fully equipped for the operational challenges that lie ahead. Major COCOM exercises where

interagency coordination is exercised include Unified Endeavor Mission Rehearsal Exercises (JFCOM), Blue Advance (SOUTHCOM), Terminal Fury (PACOM) and Flexible Leader (EUCOM).

These events expose the commander and his staff to the challenges of interagency coordination and drive home the fact that crises cannot be resolved by military means alone. The Unified Endeavor series of exercises replicates the environment in Iraq, Afghanistan or Horn of Africa to include significant participation by non-DOD agencies that are operating alongside our forces in these countries. Blue Advance 08, currently being executed by SOUTHCOM and supported by JFCOM, is incorporating many of the concepts from the Interagency Management System and has significant participation from S/CRS, DOS and USAID.

To assist civilian agencies to meet the many demands for exercise involvement, JFCOM has published the *Civilian Partnership and Training Opportunities Catalog*. Written in simple layman's terms, the aim of the catalog is to facilitate decision-making in the interagency community regarding engagement with DOD leading to a better understanding of each other's cultures. We are in the process of expanding the catalog to include experimentation and other opportunities to further assist the civilian agencies in their selection of the best events to meet their capacity development needs.

JFCOM also supports the National Defense University by conducting the CAPSTONE and PINNACLE Joint Operations Modules. CAPSTONE is for newly selected flag and general officers while PINNACLE is focused on 2 and 3 star flag and general officers. Each CAPSTONE and PINNACLE class normally includes representatives from other government agencies and both modules stress the importance of interagency coordination and a whole of government approach to both preventing crisis and reacting to crisis.

JFCOM manages the DOD distributed learning capability known as Joint Knowledge Development and Distribution Capability (JKDDC) where learning content is distributed via the Joint Knowledge Online (JKO) portal. JFCOM is currently working with DOS and USAID to develop distance learning modules that will support the fundamental understanding of each agency's mission, structure, roles and responsibilities, and operational differences. JFCOM expects this training to be available online by end of March 08.

Conclusion

JFCOM is engaged in a broad array of efforts to develop Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations concepts and joint doctrine and to improve DOD and interagency integration and capabilities, and is rapidly inserting the results of these efforts into the operating force. Active involvement by our interagency partners in these efforts is significantly contributing to the successful and meaningful development of concepts, tools and processes that are advancing the integration of US government agencies in response to the challenges of Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations. The collaborative experimentation on the comprehensive approach with our international partners illuminates this work with the reality of coalition operations and other perspectives. Thank you for the opportunity to share these observations with you.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
UNTIL RELEASED BY
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM
UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

STATEMENT OF

BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT H. HOLMES

DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND

BEFORE THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

ON IRREGULAR WARFARE

FEBRUARY 26, 2008

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM,
UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

STATEMENT OF
DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONS

BRIGADIER GENERAL ROBERT H. HOLMES

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM AND UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 2008

Good afternoon, Chairman Snyder, Chairman Smith, Ranking Member Akin, Ranking Member Thornberry, and members of the subcommittees. Today, I will provide you a brief description associated with organizations and activities that include our interagency partners as CENTCOM pursues the lines of operation associated with irregular warfare and stability operations. In these organizations – the Joint Interagency Coordination Group, the Effects Synchronization Committee and our emerging Irregular Warfare Fusion Center, you will see we are pursuing horizontal and vertical integration of component war fighting activities with other Interagency instruments of power. This will provide not only kinetic combative effects associated with traditional military operations, but also positive effects along the lines of diplomacy, governance, intelligence, information, economic development, law enforcement, threat finance, as well as societal and cultural development.

In addition to these three organizations at the Combatant Command Headquarters – there are three interagency coordination activities at a tactical level

within our component organizations (I would be able to discuss these further in a classified forum).

CENTCOM understands that the protracted nature of irregular warfare requires joint forces working in concert with the interagency and our multinational partners, with persistent presence and sustained effort over a long duration. The Department of Defense Directive 3000.05 and the Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept serve as policy guidance for our efforts.

The battlefield lessons of the last five years demonstrate that conventional military operations are but one component in a vast array of capabilities the USG has at its disposal to defend and preserve national security interests. We have achieved success in the security line of operation against mid and some senior level al-Qa'ida and Taliban members in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan. To secure these gains we must sustain and refine CENTCOM's interagency relationships and capabilities. Additionally, our general purpose and special operations forces within the CENTCOM AOR continue to benefit from the integration of USG's interagency capabilities. CENTCOM accomplishes interagency integration through our Joint Interagency Coordination Group (JIACG), the Effects Synchronization Committee (ESC), and the role of interagency representatives at the command. We continue to refine and improve interagency integration in our irregular warfare activities and stability operations. While not seamless, interagency integration continues to make demonstrable progress in the Iraq and Afghan theaters. First, I'd like to highlight CENTCOM's integration of the

interagency as it functions today, and then I'll cite some examples of how that capability is employed and integrated with the Joint and Coalition Task Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The Joint Interagency Coordination Group, formed in 2001, is a multifunctional advisory and coordinating element that works across directorate lines to integrate interagency capabilities, resources and authorities into USCENTCOM operations and plans. The JIACG has liaison officers in Iraq and Afghanistan with Multi-National Force – Iraq, the FBI Baghdad Operations Center (BOC), Iraq Threat Finance Cell (ITFC), and U.S. Embassy Kabul. These liaison personnel maintain the conduits necessary for Interagency and CENTCOM operations and planning. CENTCOM hosts interagency representatives from DOS, DOJ, DHS, DEA and Treasury, providing both their headquarters and this command with planning and coordination capabilities against global terrorist threats.

Operationalizing interagency activities within CENTCOM is accomplished through the Effects Synchronization Committee. The ESC is composed of a series of working groups and a bi-weekly secure video teleconferences with DIA, DOJ, Treasury, DHS and DOS. ESC Accomplishments include developed of a criminalization process tied to INTERPOL; as well as assisting in financial sanctions, Department of State demarches, interagency information sharing, rewards programs, and enabling effective strategic communications.

Ongoing Interagency and DOD activities:

CENTCOM POLAD and the JIACG DOS liaison are the command conduits for information sharing between Main State and the Embassies. Additionally, the DOS and the DOD-lead Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) are an interagency entity designed to build provincial government capacities in Iraq and Afghanistan. PRT members are also provided by USAID and USDA.

As part of the Presidential-directed civilian surge in Iraq, additional PRT's were embedded with brigade combat teams. DOD utilized reserve military and DOD civilian personnel to meet the immediate surge requirement.

Additionally, to augment Afghanistan PRT's, the National Guard Bureau sources Agri-business Development Teams (ADT), partnered with U.S. Farm Bureaus and universities providing agronomy expertise to Afghan farmers and government agriculture programs.

The Treasury Department in concert with CENTCOM is denying terrorist and insurgent groups access to financial resources through designations. The Treasury Department also co-leads The Iraq Threat Finance Cell (ITFC) to disrupt the flow of money to terrorists and insurgents. Treasury was instrumental in the development of the Executive Orders aimed at Iraq insurgents, al-Qa'ida, the Taliban and Hezbollah, and those individuals and entities responsible for committing terrorist acts. Many of the coordinative efforts on the implementation of these executive orders between CENTCOM and Treasury take place in the ESC.

The DOJ's Liaisons to the DOD Combatant Commands serve as conduits for Counterterrorism, Counterintelligence, Counterespionage, and Law Enforcement information; provide an Justice perspective to the DOD in their efforts to fight global terrorism; keep the DOJ Executive Management apprized of these efforts; and, where appropriate, leverage and coordinate the capabilities and resources of both agencies to prevent, deter, and respond to terrorism and other threats to national security.

CENTCOM Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Task Force (C-IED TF) works with the Justice, Treasury and Commerce to disrupt the effects of IED networks.

The DEA's two interests in Iraq at this time are: the prosecution of former Ba'athist regime elements and investigation of illegal drug sales that add to insurgent financing.

In Afghanistan, the DEA assisted in creating the National Interdiction Unit (NIU), a counter drug organization and the Counter Narcotics Police of Afghanistan. The DEA also co-sponsors the Interagency Operations Coordination Center (IOCC) in Kabul. The IOCC is a joint UK/US venture with the mission to coordinate and de-conflict law enforcement counter drug operations.

In conclusion, interagency collaboration over the past five years has matured to a point where the establishment of an Irregular Warfare Fusion Center (IWFC) is the logical next step in greater interagency integration for current and future threats. The IWFC will be CENTCOM's operations, intelligence, and

interagency focal point for orchestrating persistent, coordinated, and synchronized effects.

Thank you for the opportunity to meet with you today.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

STATEMENT OF

COLONEL JOSEPH E. OSBORNE, U.S. ARMY

DIRECTOR, IRREGULAR WARFARE DIRECTORATE (J10)

UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

BEFORE A JOINT HEARING OF THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS AND

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TERRORISM, UNCONVENTIONAL THREATS AND

CAPABILITIES

ON IRREGULAR WARFARE AND STABILITY OPERATIONS

FEBRUARY 26, 2008

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

STATEMENT OF
COLONEL JOSEPH E. OSBORNE, U.S. ARMY
DIRECTOR, IRREGULAR WARFARE DIRECTORATE
UNITED STATES SPECIAL OPERATIONS COMMAND

Chairman Smith, Chairman Snyder, Representative Akin, Representative Thornberry, and distinguished members of the committees, I am honored to be here today to report to you on the continuing efforts of the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) to move the Irregular Warfare concept to a full scale capability for our command, the department and our nation. I would like to center my comments on three areas that I believe are of interest to the committee; the establishment of the Irregular Warfare Directorate, or J10, at USSOCOM, our work with the interagency, and the role of Strategic Communications in the broader context of Irregular Warfare.

The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review identified several initiatives necessary to give the Department greater capability and agility in dealing with the most common threats of the 21st Century. Irregular Warfare was high among those initiatives. For USSOCOM our first significant task was to provide fifty plus years of Irregular Warfare history, experience and culture and fuse it with the development and publication of the Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept (JOC) signed by the Secretary of Defense in September 2007. The central idea of this concept is that elements of the Defense Department (DOD), in conjunction with other instruments of national and international power and influence, will conduct Irregular Warfare operations in protracted regional and global campaigns designed to subvert, disrupt, attrite, and exhaust an adversary. While this notion does not preclude conventional military confrontation, it does address

that in practice, most wars and campaigns are hybrids of irregular and conventional operations.

In order to maintain the momentum in Irregular Warfare planning and policy development, The Commander of USSOCOM, established an Irregular Warfare Directorate, designated as the J10, in June 2007. We reached our Initial Operating Capability (IOC) in October of last year and we continue to grow and expand our capabilities. The J10 provides continuous focus on Irregular Warfare related issues cutting across all operational and programmatic lines. Our efforts are divided between our own headquarters and the remainder of the department and interagency. Within our headquarters, we provide a unifying voice to monitor and focus the efforts of the command and ensure there is a consistent application of Irregular Warfare theory across all of our components. External to USSOCOM we work closely with and through the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict and Interdependent Capability to support DOD's efforts to develop and integrate the concepts, capabilities and capacity necessary to wage protracted Irregular Warfare on a global scale.

The Commander's intent for my directorate is very straight forward: "Coordinate concept implementation, strategy development, plans integration, and a collaborative network of the DOD and the interagency to facilitate U.S. government (USG) application of Irregular Warfare strategies in support of U.S. national objectives".

In effect, our role is as enablers for both USSOCOM and our partners to be as capable in Irregular Warfare as they are in conventional warfare. We see ourselves as

one of the key conduits for Irregular Warfare collaboration with DOD, and our Interagency partners and Allies.

In a world characterized by protracted struggles where information, influence, and beliefs are all part of the operational environment, Irregular Warfare provides a uniquely suited paradigm. There is no strategist or thinker today who disagrees with the notion that this paradigm must not be considered as purely military in nature. Consistent with this thinking we recognize that Irregular Warfare is a logical, long-term (or even generational) approach to applying all elements of national power in concert with our partner nations to achieve U.S. national objectives and protect our vital interests and the interests of our allies.

While the impetus to bring "all elements" to bear is clear, the mechanism to do this is not yet fully implemented. At USSOCOM we have, under the authorities of the Unified Command Plan and the DOD plan to defeat terrorist networks, established a number of protocols that help us meet the challenge. Within our Center for Special Operations we have established a standing Interagency Task Force (IATF) comprised of military members from our headquarters and representatives from across the inter-agency. The mission of the IATF is to serve as a coordinating activity within DOD and across the Interagency. One of their primary goals is to be a reliable and connected entity that is able to integrate IA efforts while solving discrete problem sets that support the War on Terror. One of the key tasks for the IATF is to link knowledge with decision makers (DOD and USG). Additionally, we have established an Interagency Partnership Program that currently places 40 USSOCOM staff officers into billets at 13

agencies and departments. These officers provide critical situational awareness and connectivity between USSOCOM and their host organizations.

Perhaps our most broad reaching effort has been the development and implementation of the Global Synchronization process. This initiative is best characterized as a continuous, day-to-day systematic program that virtually fuses the efforts of the Geographic Combatant Commands, the Functional Combatant Commands, the agencies within the department and, most importantly, the interagency and our key allies. This process is punctuated every six months by a Global Synchronization Conference held at our headquarters. To give you a flavor of both the depth and cross cutting nature of this process: USSOCOM participates in hundreds of Video Tele-Conferences every month reaching out to literally every DOD entity and the entire Interagency Community, as well as to our key allies. Our last Global Synch Conference, held in October 2007, had 585 attendees with representatives from across DoD, 14 of our interagency partners and 3 of our allies. Most significantly, 20 of the 78 attendees of the final executive session represented non-DOD agencies or departments.

These efforts represent the major muscle movements in a headquarters that does an enormous amount of outreach. By way of example, in the five short months since my Directorate achieved initial operational capability, we have been invited to participate and brief at Joint Staff Defense Planning Scenario conferences, the Security Force Assistance Symposium, Irregular Warfare Capabilities Based Assessments, the Consortium for Complex Operations and numerous additional conferences and venues. We have also been invited to brief the faculty at West Point, the Naval Academy and the

Air Force Command and Staff College. Admiral Olson was a keynote speaker at the Marine Corps Long War Conference, the NDIA/SOLIC Symposium and is scheduled to speak at the Johns Hopkins Unrestricted Warfare Conference. It is clearly the goal of USSOCOM to promote better understanding of Irregular Warfare and foster collaboration among an ever growing community of interest.

While all of this interagency engagement is promising, many challenges remain. The noteworthy work and realized successes are largely the result of good people at every level of our government trying to do the right thing for our nation. Much of the cooperation is initially based on personal relationships established by USSOCOM that opens doors and encourages aggressive collaboration at every level. In short, our success in interagency integration requires constant monitoring and attention.

Before I discuss the role of strategic communication I'd like to provide the context of the DOD's definition of Irregular Warfare. It is "a violent struggle among state and non-state actors for legitimacy and influence over the relevant populations." Irregular Warfare favors indirect and asymmetric approaches, though it may employ the full range of military and other capabilities, in order to erode an adversary's power, influence, and will." One of the unique challenges in planning an Irregular Warfare campaign is developing a fused strategy that recognizes the primacy of strategic communication.

While opportunities to push critical USG messages abound, many challenges make these efforts more difficult than they initially appear. For example, the ability to communicate in the most appropriate medium is not necessarily aligned with the authority to do so. Additionally, the networked, asymmetric enemy we face transcends

geographical boundaries so commonly used by the USG to assign communication responsibilities and deconflict the same. Complicating matters further is the nature of the information age where tactical actions can have strategic implications. It is for these reasons that continued investment in strategic communication plans, processes, and products are vital to the successful prosecution of Irregular Warfare.

Effective strategic communications represents the defining characteristic of the indirect approach that is so critical to effective Irregular Warfare. Deeds, in synchronization with words, are at the core of this approach. This is the mindset that has historically allowed Special Operations Forces to gain access, build relationships, foster influence, and legitimize our partners by being true partners. As partners, we imbue the concept of professional military and security forces which are subject to the rule of law and operating under the broad rubric of respect for their citizens and adherence to the standards of human rights. This is also the same mindset that is taking hold in the rest of DOD. Indirect activities such as foreign counterpart training, civil-military operations, information distribution, infrastructure development, and the establishment of medical, dental, and veterinary clinics are now commonplace to our full spectrum forces operating in Iraq and Afghanistan. Across the services steps are being taken to formalize these skills and attributes and apply them in broader engagement type activities. The effect of these deeds is significantly diminished if not re-enforced with the words from Public Affairs, Military Support to Public Diplomacy and Information Operations. The goal of strategic communication must be to ensure all communications functions reflect the deeds.

The need for a unified USG message which is synchronized across the enterprise is clear. The role of Department of State as the lead for strategic communication with DOD in support is clear. Despite the absence of any compelling structure for integration, there is positive movement in this arena. The Strategic Communication Integration Group (SCIG) structure shows promise to temporarily accomplish this aim within DOD. Greater empowerment of agencies such as the Counter Terrorism Coordination Center (CTCC) and National Counter Terrorism Center (NCTC) will surely serve to best integrate DOD's supporting communication effort within the overall USG effort.

Irregular Warfare, in its truest form, has the potential to synthesize indirect and direct methods and brings all elements of U.S. national power to bear in a synchronized and coordinated manner. The Department, USSOCOM and the Services are improving their postures to both conduct and combat Irregular Warfare. Much work remains to be done and full implementation of the concepts and strategy will take an enduring commitment. We have no choice but to aggressively pursue this endeavor. Our adversaries, cognizant of our military dominance, will continue to challenge us through irregular means and methods. A reality we should all understand is that Irregular Warfare is the nature of warfare and some would say the state of the globe. We must bring to bear the entire strength of our nation and government to achieve success.

I thank the distinguished members of the subcommittees for your important role in helping us achieve continued success and enabling us to protect our nation, and I very much appreciate the opportunity to be with you here today.

This concludes my prepared remarks, and I am available to answer any questions you may have.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

FEBRUARY 26, 2008

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY DR. SNYDER

Dr. SNYDER. Assistant Secretary Vickers, the Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept identifies eight key risks and associated mitigation strategies. One is that the United States Government might not develop the interagency integration mechanisms necessary to achieve unity of effort at every level. The JOC directs DOD to conduct concept development and experimentation focused on improving interagency integration. What actions has the Department of Defense taken to address the need for interagency integration mechanisms? The same unity of effort considerations apply with respect to stability operations. Are the efforts to improve interagency integration for irregular warfare and stability operations occurring on parallel tracks that create new stovepipes?

Mr. VICKERS. The Department supports efforts to establish interagency integration mechanisms across the USG, recognizing that irregular challenges manifest themselves in ways that cannot be overcome solely by military means. The responses those challenges demand extend well beyond the traditional domain of any single government agency or department.

The Department supports recent efforts to institutionalize interagency integration, two of which are particularly focused on irregular warfare and stability operations:

– The establishment of the Department of State Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS) to lead the implementation of NSPD–44 "Management of Interagency Efforts for Reconstruction and Stabilization" to include the development of civilian capabilities and the integration of those capabilities with the U.S. military for contingencies. Several aspects of USJFCOM's Unified Action experimentation series has focused on the integration of civilian and military capabilities in support of NSPD–44.

– The establishment of the National Counter Terrorism Center (NCTC), which reports to the NSC staff, to lead interagency steady-state and surge, or contingency, planning for the War on Terrorism. Through the NCTC's Directorate for Strategic Operational Planning, DOD participates in an interagency dialogue to improve collaboration on a wide range of initiatives and objectives, such as the National Implementation Plan for the War on Terror, the National Action Plan for Combating Foreign Fighters, and the National Action Plan for Countering Terrorist Finance.

– The implementation of a semi-annual War on Terrorism Global Synchronization Conference, sponsored by the United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM). This conference brings together senior strategists, planners, and operators from all of the Combatant Commands, a broad majority of the Defense Agencies, and several of our interagency partners. Through this venue DOD has improved collaboration, promoted interoperability, maximized effects, and shared lessons learned. Each iteration of the conference draws a wider interagency audience, reinforcing the importance of working across traditional stovepipes to fully leverage all elements of national power in the War on Terrorism.

DOD has also developed interagency planning and coordination mechanisms to support operational-level integration in the field. DOD is integrating the interagency through Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACGs) established at Combatant Commands (COCOM), the structures of which are adjusted according to COCOM priorities and available interagency personnel. In addition, DOD participates as a member of the Department of State's Coordinator for Counterterrorism's Regional Security Initiative that takes a regional approach to prevail against al Qaeda and its affiliates.

Efforts to improve interagency integration do not create stovepipes. From a DOD perspective, the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy leads the development of all guidance regarding interagency integration. This guidance is developed in close coordination with the Combatant Commands, the Joint Staff, the Services, and civilian agency partners.

Dr. SNYDER. Assistant Secretary Vickers, what impact will Secretary England's direction to you to combine the Irregular Warfare Roadmap with DOD Directive 3000.05 have on the effort to put stability operations on par with combat operations?

Mr. VICKERS. The 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review identified the need to rebalance capabilities across the Department to improve joint force proficiency in countering irregular challenges. To implement the vision of the QDR, the Department developed implementation roadmaps for building partnership capacity, irregular warfare, and supporting DOD processes. DODD 3000.05, which pre-dates the 2006 QDR, provided influential foundational concepts for Departmental programs to counter irregular challenges.

Last summer, the Department reported on the progress of DODD 3000.05 initiatives to give stability operations a priority comparable to combat operations. These initiatives informed Department-wide concepts for defeating irregular challenges by working with and through the indigenous population and legitimate government to isolate and defeat irregular adversaries. As DOD worked to enhance relevant capabilities, significant synergies across capabilities became evident.

The Department is now developing a directive to capitalize on these synergies, establish capstone policy for irregular warfare capabilities, and describe the relationship among key activities, including stability operations. In so doing, the directive will integrate the key lessons learned from the QDR Execution Roadmaps, DODD 3000.05, and best practices from current operations. It will synchronize capability development across a wider range of operational environments—permissive, contested, and denied. This approach will help DOD maintain readiness for more contingencies—and provide the Nation with more strategic alternatives.

Recognizing that stability operations are essential to traditional warfare, irregular warfare, and a range of activities that are not characterized as warfare per se, the Department continues to develop initiatives under the auspices of NSPD–44 and other interagency authorities. Our strategic guidance reflects this view, and recognizes that in many cases unified action across multiple government agencies is crucial to enduring success. DOD remains engaged with our interagency and international partners to create synergies among our capabilities and synchronize their application in pursuing national security objectives.

Dr. SNYDER. Assistant Secretary Vickers, can you comment on how the President's FY 2009 budget reflects implementation of the policy to make stability operations as important as combat operations in terms of doctrine, organization, training, material, leadership and education, personnel and facilities (or the so-called "DOT-MIL-P-F")?

Mr. VICKERS. DOD will not be creating separate stability operations budget lines, but rather driving a shift in capability development priorities. DOD is working through existing capabilities development processes to determine future needs. A critical element of that process will be determining those adaptations made in response to Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom and funded through supplemental appropriations that need to be institutionalized for this new environment.

The Office of the Secretary of Defense is working with the Services and Combatant Commands to identify and prioritize the 'full range' of capabilities required for Irregular Warfare and Stability Operations to include their DOTMLPF implications.

In his recent testimony regarding the FY09 budget, the Secretary of Defense highlighted a theme running throughout the FY09 budget request: ensuring the Department is prepared to address the international landscape characterized by new threats and instability. Specific budget requests highlight this change:

– Increased End Strength: increasing Army size by 7,000 over and Marine Corps by 5,000 over FY08 levels enabling the Department to relieve stress on the force caused by the Long War and ensuring it is able to excel at conventional warfare and counterinsurgency operations. (Personnel)

– Global Train and Equip: providing commanders a means to fill longstanding gaps in our ability to build the capacity and capabilities of partner nations. (Authorities)

– Security & Stabilization Assistance: allowing the Department to transfer up to $200 million to the State Department to facilitate whole-of-government responses to stability and security missions. (Authorities)

– AFRICOM: funding to launch the new Africa Command, allowing the Department to have a more integrated approach. (Organization)

– Foreign Languages: providing for increased language training for all forces to improve preparation for irregular warfare, training and advising missions, humanitarian efforts, and security and stabilization operations. (Training)

Dr. SNYDER. Assistant Secretary Vickers, GAO reported that DOD has not fully established mechanisms that would help it obtain interagency participation in the military planning process at the combatant commands. What mechanisms currently exist to facilitate interagency coordination at the combatant commands and how effective are they? What mechanisms are planned for the future? JFCOM reports that OSD declined to take further action on its concept of operations for the role and placement of Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACGs) at the combatant commands. Can you explain the rationale behind that decision?

Mr. VICKERS. DOD is developing mechanisms to increase interagency participation in the military planning process here in DC, at the combatant commands, and in the field. In many ways, the most important integration points are here in DC and in the field, at U.S. Embassies; because those are the places where our interagency partners make decisions and operate. Other Departments and Agencies do not have organizational corollaries to Combatant Commands (COCOM), making COCOMs a difficult integration point for our interagency partners.

What mechanisms currently exist to facilitate interagency coordination at the combatant commands and how effective are they?

Each of the Geographic Combatant Commands (COCOM) has established a Joint Interagency Coordination Group (JIACG) to assist with liaison and planning at the operational level. The structure of the JIACGs varies based on the COCOM's priorities and the participation of interagency personnel. All COCOMs have noted that other Federal Agencies have difficulty providing qualified liaisons to JIACGs on a permanent basis.

Each COCOM has tailored their JIACG to fit its mission. Some examples are illustrative:

– USSOUTHCOM has established a J9 staff section that includes the JIACG liaisons as well as military staff to coordinate interagency efforts. In the context of USSOUTHCOM's operational environment and focus, this approach works well.

– USNORTHCOM's mission and location uses a different approach—using direct liaison with Federal agencies as well as a JIACG.

– USEUCOM and USPACOM both employ JIACGs for interagency planning, and participation is tailored to their respective missions.

It is important to note that DOD is currently funding interagency participation in JIACG organizations. It may be more effective for other Federal Agencies to program and fund JIACG personnel, creating a more stable personnel management method and expanding the pool of qualified interagency planners and operators.

What mechanisms are planned for the future?

Recent changes to DOD planning guidance encourage interagency cooperation in the development of military plans. DOD is working with interagency partners on selected plans already. As these efforts progress, DOD will identify best practices and incorporate lessons learned into future guidance. We are grateful to the State Department for the input it has provided on selected plans.

In addition, the development and use of whole-of-government planning frameworks will facilitate civilian agency integration into military planning and vice versa. Recent interagency involvement in global war on terror planning through U.S. Special Operations Command's (USSOCOM) Global Synch Conference is a good model upon which the Department will look to build for the future. In addition, DOD has collaborated on the development of the Integration Planning Cell concept, a team of civilian agency planners and experts who would deploy to the CoCom under the Interagency Management System, to facilitate the harmonization of military and civilian planning for reconstruction and stabilization.

JFCOM reports that OSD declined to take further action on its concept of operations for the role and placement of Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACGs) at the combatant commands. Can you explain the rationale behind that decision?

DOD does not want to impose a one-size-fits all approach. Rather, we recommended that the COCOMs tailor their JIACGs for regional missions.

Dr. SNYDER. Assistant Secretary Vickers, GAO reported that DOD's policies and practices inhibit sharing of planning information and limit interagency participation in the development of combatant command plans. Specifically, DOD does not have a process in place to facilitate information sharing with non-DOD agencies early in the process without the specific approval of the Secretary of Defense. What steps

is DOD taking to amend its policies and practices to improve information sharing with interagency partners in the planning process?

Mr. VICKERS. Currently, we share aspects of many of our plans with elements of other agencies, while not necessarily sharing the entire plan itself. When DOD considers sharing its campaign and contingency plans, the Department must balance the benefits with the need for force protection, operational security, and timely plan development. Combatant Commands can work in coordination with OUSD(P) and Joint Staff to integrate other agencies into plan development with the approval of the Secretary of Defense. In the execution of current operations, DOD encourages field coordination between Combatant Commanders and the Chiefs of Missions as well as with liaison officers.

Recent changes to DOD planning guidance task the COCOMs to develop campaign plans, moving the Department away from an exclusive focus on contingency-driven planning. Campaign plans will provide an opportunity for greater coordination and synchronization of USG activities to shape the current security environment in order to prevent potential threats to our national security interests from developing.

However, to ensure the maximum effectiveness of input from interagency partners, the USG must build the capabilities of other agencies to understand military planning, review military plans, and engage in national-level planning processes.

Regarding information sharing, DOD's Chief Information Office (CIO) established an Information Sharing Steering Group to serve as the focal point for guidance, direction, and oversight of DOD information-sharing initiatives. This effort builds upon the most effective practices in cooperative venues like the National Counter Terrorism Center (NCTC).

The CIO has a number of ongoing initiatives to improve information sharing across agencies, e.g.:

– An Information Sharing Action Plan for Civil-Military support to stability operations that enhances unclassified components of civil-military planning in a collaborative environment.

– An Information Sharing Task Force with other Federal Departments to establish an information sharing environment that spans agency boundaries.

These efforts, along with the provision of required authorities and funding to procure the necessary information technologies across the Federal Government, will enhance whole-of government collaboration under the process envisioned by applicable NSPDs.

Note: In a separate venue, the Department can provide an overview of the progress we have seen in our partnerships with the intelligence community to increase our effectiveness in supporting international partners in eliminating the most dangerous threats to security.

Dr. SNYDER. How does S/CRS currently view its role in leading or otherwise supporting the NSPD–44 process?

Ambassador HERBST. Under NSPD–44, the President has vested in the Secretary of State the responsibility to coordinate and lead integrated U.S. Government efforts to prepare, plan for, and conduct reconstruction and stabilization operations. S/CRS has been charged by the Secretary with implementing this directive. S/CRS has led and will continue to lead the interagency effort in Washington to implement the President's vision to develop the systems and procedures to provide comprehensive, whole-of-government planning for and management of reconstruction and stabilization policy and operations.

Dr. SNYDER. What are the roles and responsibilities of the regional bureaus and the new Foreign Assistance Bureau? For example, in Iraq and Afghanistan, the regional bureaus, not S/CRS, have the lead.

Ambassador HERBST. In carrying out its responsibilities under NSPD–44, S/CRS works closely with the regional bureaus, with other State Department bureaus, and with other Departments and Agencies as appropriate. Should a decision be made to activate the Interagency Management System for Reconstruction and Stabilization (IMS) to address a particular crisis, the Country Reconstruction and Stabilization Group (the Washington-based interagency policy coordination body for the situation) would be co-chaired by the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, the Assistant Secretary of the relevant regional bureau, and an appropriate regional senior director from the National Security Council staff. The CRSG works within the context of the State Department regional bureau's foreign policy lead and the Secretary's foreign assistance structure.

Dr. SNYDER. How would you describe the current status of interagency planning for stabilization and reconstruction activities?

Ambassador HERBST. S/CRS has developed processes and mechanisms for enabling and supported whole-of-government planning for reconstruction and stabilization operations, based on NSPD–44. These planning processes can be applied with or without the Interagency Management System (IMS).

The Reconstruction and Stabilization Policy Coordination Committee coordinates interagency efforts to develop a planning framework for U.S. reconstruction and stabilization operations. This framework has been tested and exercised in a number of civilian-military exercises, experiments, and table top events. The planning framework has been taught to U.S. Government personnel (both civilian and military) through the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute and at numerous military education and training institutions. Allied nations have also participated in S/CRS training.

S/CRS has facilitated and/or assisted interagency planning for specific country engagements in support of U.S. national security interests. S/CRS country-planning efforts drawing on the whole-of-government approach have been applied to Sudan, Haiti, Cuba (in support of CAFC II), Kosovo, and Afghanistan (at the PRT level). These planning efforts involved significant participation from across the civilian agencies and DOD.

Dr. SNYDER. What specific actions is State taking to facilitate a greater understanding of the planning processes and capabilities between DOD and non-DOD organizations for stabilization and reconstruction activities?

Ambassador HERBST. S/CRS is undertaking many actions to facilitate greater reciprocal understanding in both civilian and military planning processes and capabilities. Specifically, we are engaged in joint planning activities, development and application of an interagency planning framework, outreach to DOD, joint education endeavors, and interagency exercises.

For example, in close coordination with DOD, S/CRS is heavily engaged in interagency planning for a range of country stabilization and reconstruction efforts, such as Afghanistan, Kosovo, and Haiti. These real-world engagements are perhaps the best way to involve our civilian agency and military counterparts and expose them to the relatively new interagency planning process.

S/CRS is also leading an interagency process at the Policy Coordination Committee level to finalize the development and testing of a planning framework for stabilization and reconstruction activities—a process that will be reviewed and approved by the NSC.

In addition, S/CRS has led two separate interagency exercises over the past year with robust participation from various levels of DOD and two separate combatant commands. S/CRS has also participated in a range of military exercises, especially those where exposure to interagency planning tools and response mechanisms builds civil-military capacity. Also, S/CRS has successfully encouraged DOD and civilian agency participation in numerous reconstruction and stabilization courses at the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute that give students an in-depth exposure to planning tools and new interagency capabilities provided by NSPD–44. S/CRS officers have participated and shaped the curriculum of numerous military planning courses offered by DOD as well.

S/CRS has also established relationships with OSD, Joint Staff, and every major Geographic Combatant Command and service component, in an effort to further their understanding of the interagency planning framework, the Interagency Management System (IMS), and civilian active and reserve expeditionary capabilities.

Dr. SNYDER. In your view, would the Joint Interagency Coordination Groups at the combatant command be an appropriate interagency planning mechanism to engage in deliberate planning?

Ambassador HERBST. It is my understanding that the Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACG) largely serve in an advisory role to the Commander and were not set up to perform deliberate planning. However, I would refer you to the DOD for further information on the role and capabilities of the JIACG.

Dr. SNYDER. How would the Joint Interagency Coordination Groups interact with the NSPD–44 framework's Interagency Planning Cells when stood up for crisis planning?

Ambassador HERBST. The Interagency Management System establishes a civilian planning cell that deploys to the Geographic Combatant Command (GCC) to harmonize civilian and military planning in support of U.S. reconstruction and stabilization strategic objectives. This cell would focus specifically on the planning for the reconstruction and stabilization operation, while the Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACG) would provide the Commander with advice on issues and topics related to the entire GCC Area of Responsibility.

Individual agencies (such as USAID or Justice) in consultation with the Combatant Commander, would determine if their personnel at the JIACG would support

the Integration Planning Cell (IPC) or if additional personnel would need to be deployed to fulfill the IPC requirements.

Dr. SNYDER. How, if at all, does NSC-approved Interagency Management System (IMS) developed under NSPD–44 differ from the NSPD–1 structures and processes used for operation in Iraq and Afghanistan?

Ambassador HERBST. NSPD–1 establishes the interagency bodies for consideration of policy issues affecting national security, including the Principals Committee (PC), Deputies Committee (DC), and Policy Coordination Committees (PCCs). NSPD–44 directs the Secretary of State to coordinate and lead interagency efforts to prepare, plan for, and conduct reconstruction and stabilization efforts.

As a part of the specific coordination function articulated in NSPD–44, the Secretary of State is directed to provide decision makers with detailed options for an integrated U.S. Government response to specific reconstruction and stabilization operations including recommending when to establish a limited-time PCC-level group called the Country Reconstruction and Stabilization Group (CRSG).

In accordance with NSPD–44 and NSPD–1, the CRSG have the role and responsibilities provided to a PCC. The CRSG is responsible for coordinating interagency crisis response and providing recommendations on strategic guidance on all policy and resource issues related to the specific country or crisis, including recommendations on lead roles between all elements of the interagency. It is chaired by the State Department Regional Assistant Secretary and/or Special Envoy, the National Security Council Staff Senior Regional Director, and S/CRS and includes Assistant Secretary-level membership from all relevant agencies and offices. Interagency representation on a CRSG makes this body the focal point for overall planning and program integration.

Dr. SNYDER. In what specific ways would the IMS and other elements of the framework improve the U.S. management of those operations?

Ambassador HERBST. The Interagency Management System (IMS) is fundamentally about ensuring integrated, whole-of-government planning and operational integration for future stabilization and reconstruction missions. This happens through facilitated real-time information sharing that can provide the interagency process in Washington, the Combatant Command, the Embassy, and agencies in the field with one shared operating picture and a mechanism for improved communication and decision-making. This shared picture will allow us to engage in more effective joint planning, to better leverage resources across U.S. agencies and among international partners, and would allow for more coherent mobilization of civilian and military resources to the field.

Dr. SNYDER. If the IMS would, in fact, help improve the U.S. response in Iraq and Afghanistan, why is the Administration not using the system for those operations?

Ambassador HERBST. The IMS was approved by the NSC in March 2007, well after the U.S. operations in Afghanistan and Iraq were already underway. S/CRS and other departments and agencies that were actively involved in developing the IMS have worked with the Afghanistan Interagency Operations Group (AIOG) and the Iraq Policy and Operations Group (IPOG) to facilitate the sharing of stabilization and reconstruction lessons learned to help improve the U.S. response. Given the wealth of operational experience and lessons learned already resident in the existing interagency structures for Afghanistan and Iraq, it would not be advantageous to implement the IMS for those engagements at this time.

Dr. SNYDER. How will DOD's new direction to issue a comprehensive irregular warfare directive impact the NSPD–44 efforts? Will NSPD–44 be rewritten?

Ambassador HERBST. NSPD–44 provides a whole of government planning and operating framework for operations that require similar supporting DOD capabilities.

Within the context of NSPD–44, the Pentagon has the responsibility to develop its own departmental doctrine for contributing to the U.S. Government response to national security challenges such as failed and failing states.

Dr. SNYDER. How will your office be involved in irregular warfare planning?

Ambassador HERBST. In the context of NSPD–44, we are working with the Pentagon and Combatant Commands on stabilization and reconstruction issues and expect this cooperation to continue as DOD works out its doctrine.

Dr. SNYDER. Representative Marshall asked you to name any authors or writings that struck you as especially perceptive insights on how our country should best confront the unconventional threats it faces. Would you please name any authors or works that have influenced your thinking, whether in agreement or disagreement, on this subject?

Ambassador HERBST. The following works have been particularly useful to me in my work:

- *State-Building: Governance and World Order in the 21st Century,* by Frank Fukuyama;
- *The Pentagon's New Map,* by Thomas Barnett;
- *The Beginner's Guide to Nation Building,* by James Dobbins, Seth Jones, Keith Crane, and Beth Cole DeGrasse; and
- *Political Order in Changing Societies,* by Samuel Huntington.

Dr. SNYDER. General Holmes, please describe CENTCOM's Joint Interagency Coordination Group including who is on it and what they do.

General HOLMES. USCENTCOM Joint Interagency Coordination Group's (JIACG) mission is to facilitate planning by the Commander, USCENTCOM, and his staff; coordinate information sharing between U.S. military and U.S. government agencies; and advise Commander, USCENTCOM and staff on interagency issues in the execution of U.S. Central Command's mission.

However, as directed by the acting Commander, the Joint Interagency Coordination Group merged into an Interagency Task Force (IATF) to continue this mission and better incorporate other Central Command elements by combining the offices of JIACG, Counter-Improvised Explosive Device (Counter-IED) Group, Strategic Communications and Information Operations into one division within the Operations (J3) Directorate.

IATF provides: 1) a whole of government approach to USCENTCOM engagements, 2) multi-agency and multi-lateral coordination across Areas of Responsibility (AOR) and Combatant Command (COCOM) objectives, and 3) regional influence/venue coordination.

Focus areas supported by IATF are:

1) Set conditions for stability in Iraq through:
   a. Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs)
   b. Training Programs for Border Security, Threat Finance, and Rule of Law
   c. Iraq Threat Finance Cell
2) Expand governance and security in Afghanistan through:
   a. PRTs
   b. Counter Narcotics Efforts
   c. Counter Threat Finance
   d. Training Programs
3) Degrade violent extremist networks and operations, with defeating al Qaeda the priority through:
   a. Detainee interrogations support
   b. High Value Individual
   c. Iraq Threat Finance Cell
   d. Counter-Improvised Explosive Device (IED) support
4) Strengthen relationships and influence states and organizations to contribute to regional stability and the free flow of commerce through the Alternative Development Program.
5) Posture the force to build and sustain joint and combined warfighting capabilities and readiness in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Major Regional Exercises.

Issues requiring an interagency approach include:

1) Strategic Effects, 2) Weapons of Mass Destruction, 3) Regional War on Terror, 4) Transnational Crime, 5) Maritime, Port & Border Security, 6) Disaster Relief, 7) Counter-Terrorism, 8) Counter Threat Finance, 9) Long-Term Posture, 10) Security Assistance, 11) Non-Combatant Evacuation Operations, 12) Counter-IED, 13) Counter-Narcotics, 14) Pandemic Influenza, 15) Exercise Support to OIF/OEF, 16) Strategic Communication, 17) Partner Security Forces, 18) Foreign Humanitarian Assistance and 19) Noncombatant Evacuation Operations.

The IATF participates in planning efforts with the following organizations:

1) Effects Synchronization Committee—CENTCOM's committee to synchronize collection and strategic targeting against those who significantly influence the operations, direction or funding of terrorists and terrorist insurgencies throughout the region

2) National Counter Terrorism Center.

To achieve the interagency approach, IATF integrates, coordinates, and synchronizes the following personnel to meet non-traditional security threats and challenges:

1) Director (SES, with 0–7 oversight)
2) Deputy Director (0–6)
3) Three Branch Chiefs (2 x 0–6, 1 x GS–15)
4) Admin Support (1 officer, 3 enlisted)
5) Action Officers (Mix of officer, enlisted, civilian)
6) Representatives from other Federal agencies including: Department of State, Federal Bureau of Investigations, Drug Enforcement Agency, Department of Homeland Security, Treasury Department, and United States Agency for International Development.

Dr. SNYDER. General Holmes, CENTCOM's Combined Joint Task Force—Horn of Africa conducts many of the core missions inherent in stability operations. What interagency participation is there at the CJTF headquarters and what part does your Joint Interagency Coordination Group play in organizing the efforts of the other departments and agencies in support of the task force?

General HOLMES. Interagency participation in the Combined Joint Task Force—Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA) is largely coordinated in the Embassy Djibouti Country Team. The CENTCOM IATF coordinates several classified interagency operations among the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) and Department of State (DOS).

The IATF serves as a coordinator between the interagency organizations in Washington, DC and the CJTF-HOA. Specifically, our Department of State Liaison facilitates host nation permission for military entry into territorial waters of a HOA nation to effect a counternarcotics operation. Further, Department of State supports embassies or consulates in every HOA country except for Somalia. Our FBI Liaison facilitates investigations and coordinates U.S. law enforcement actions in the HOA nations as requested by the U.S. or local governments.

Dr. SNYDER. General Holmes, CENTCOM appears to have exercised only a monitoring role of its Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq and Afghanistan. While there are differences between the composition and mission emphasis of the teams in Iraq and Afghanistan, shouldn't CENTCOM be playing a greater role in developing the joint and even interagency doctrine that guides them? How is CENTCOM assessing the progress the PRTs are making?

General HOLMES. At the combatant command level, CENTCOM conducts and oversees its components with instructions for policy guidance, promulgates Department of Defense directives and other documents such as handbooks and assists in the implementation of operating concepts and memos of agreement from Joint Staff, Office of Secretary of Defense and the interagency. CENTCOM provides doctrine review and recommends Tactics, Training and Procedures (TTP) to Joint Forces Command regarding Stability Operations.

Primarily, CENTCOM exercises a monitoring role over PRTs, focusing mainly on stability and security progress/status in our area of responsibility. Numerous DOD and USG agencies assess (to varying levels of degrees) the progress and success of the PRTs. PRTs are managed in two diverse manners in Iraq and Afghanistan; Iraq PRTs are led by the Department of State and Afghanistan PRTs are led by the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). Both concepts achieve the overarching goals of promoting the expansion of the Central government into the provinces and mentor and coach the provincial leadership in being good stewards on behalf of the provincial population.

In Iraq PRTs have been led by the Department of State, since inception. Originally, called Provincial Support Teams (PST) they have limited military involvement. After Ambassador Khalilizad moved from Afghanistan to Iraq at the end of 2004, the PRT program stepped forward because he saw this as the way ahead and supported its development. When they were reconfigured into the PRTs of today, Civil Affairs was tasked to be the lead military element within the PRT, directed by the Department of State.

The current military/civilian relationship in Iraq is effective and progressive. MNF-I forces continually incorporate non-kinetic options into their operational missions with success. PRT staffs work with Brigade Combat Teams as well as the interagency and other non-governmental agencies to effect positive change in the communities they serve. As security improves, PRT effects will increase as all personnel are able to interact more freely. The project development and monies for Iraq PRTs are actually not at issue, since Iraqi budgets fund their projects and Iraq Provincial Councils are developing construction plans in accordance with the Iraq Development Strategy.

ISAF administers PRT activities in Afghanistan. ISAF, with help from its many member nations is achieving coherence among all 26 PRTs by solidifying personnel from over 20 different nations into an organized command quite capable of assisting the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (IRoA). In demonstration, ISAF published its PRT Handbook; endorsed by the ambassadorial-level PRT Executive Steering Committee (ESC) in Kabul as the standard for PRT operation. This document focuses in on the various pillars that need shaping in order to have a functioning society. This culminates more than four years of inputs from the GOA, ISAF, Combined Forces Command—Afghanistan (CFC-A), United Nations Assistance Mission Afghanistan (UNAMA) and international development agencies. The handbook outlines basic guiding principles and proven best practices each PRT should draw upon when designing and implementing strategy to meet the challenges of its particular area of operations. ISAF also orchestrates the efforts each government's financial efforts, ensuring all accomplishments are nested and vetted against the Afghanistan National Development Plan (ANDP). ISAF also works with USAID and other major contributors to manage projects across the country with funds provided by sources in addition to each PRT's lead government.

Dr. SNYDER. General Holmes, a new irregular warfare document will replace DODD 3000.05. Is CENTCOM taking a proactive role in assessing and recording its counterinsurgency experience from Iraq and Afghanistan for inclusion in this directive?

General HOLMES. USCENTCOM has conducted active collection through other agents, including USSOCOM and USJFCOM, and established a classified lessons learned program which receives information, recommendations and suggestions from all sources. This data is collected, assessed and validated against findings and observations collected while forces are engaged in Irregular Warfare/Counter-Insurgency (COIN) operations. These findings (or lessons learned) cover the full spectrum of COIN operations from non-kinetic activities to full kinetic actions. The information is contained in a database to archive these lessons learned and will eventually be resident on our command's Joint Lessons Learned Information System (JILLS) database and in USJFCOM's Joint Lessons Learned Repository (JLLR), (both systems are currently under development and implementation). A number of Joint Urgent Operational Needs (JUONs) and Immediate Warfighter Needs (IWNs) statements of requirement have been initiated by USCENTCOM that will enhance ongoing and future COIN operations.

Dr. SNYDER. Colonel Osborne, according to the Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept, in the future, Irregular Warfare campaigns will increasingly require military general purpose forces to perform missions that in the last few decades have been viewed primarily as Special Operation Forces (SOF) activities. How might this change the future mission of SOF?

Colonel OSBORNE. In my opinion, SOF will not change its core tasks or mission focus. However, an increased use of general purpose forces in select scenarios will increase our capacity to conduct engagement activities and allow SOF to focus on the most appropriate missions.

Dr. SNYDER. Colonel Osborne, the Irregular Warfare Joint Operating Concept proposes three alternatives for further development and experimentation that would provide models to coordinate interagency command and control: (1) extending the Joint Interagency Task Force (JIATF) to irregular warfare; (2) establishing interagency Advisory Assistance Teams at sub-national levels of government; and (3) expanding the use of U.S. Military Groups (MILGRPs) to conduct and support irregular warfare. Can you explain the pros and cons of each approach?

Colonel OSBORNE. The potential approaches identified in the Irregular Warfare (IW) Joint Operating Concept (JOC) are being explored as part of the concept development and experimentation currently underway by the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM), Joint Forces Command and a number of other agencies. Some thoughts are expressed below however a thorough analysis has yet to be completed.

The Joint Interagency Task Force (JIATF) Model has proved to be a valuable command and control mechanism for integrating civil-military operations in operational areas, but have been historically a short term military led organization. JIATF's operate under the operational control of the Geographic Combatant Commander and are by definition not part of the U.S. Mission (Embassy), therefore not part of the Country team which could lead to sub-optimization and over-militarization of the "whole-of-government" approach to solving or managing the political problem in question.

The IA Advisory Assistance Teams at the sub-national levels of government have proven to be successful, but more recent Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Iraq have been challenged because of insufficient numbers of them, being asked to

do too much, inadequate civilian manning, inadequate efforts to integrate them, and a relatively lower priority than combat units.

The expanded MILGRP Model could be a long term solution and organic to the U.S. Mission, fully integrated into the Country Team, and much more likely to subordinate its military activities to the broader "whole-of-government" approach led by the Chief of Mission. Although a permanent organization would solidify relationships and allow for continuous oversight more effectively, it would require more infrastructure and manning to execute. This model will also likely have to function under constraints imposed by both the host nation and our own Country Team.

Dr. SNYDER. Colonel Osborne, please describe SOCOM's Interagency Task Force. How does it relate to the J–10, which you direct? How does the J–10 interact with SOCOM's Global Synchronization Division, which works with the National Counterterrorism Center in the War on Terror?

Colonel OSBORNE. The USSOCOM Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) serves as a coordinating activity within the Department of Defense (DOD) and across the Inter-Agency (IA). The goal is to be a reliable and connected entity that is able to integrate IA efforts while solving discrete problem sets that support the global war on terror (GWOT). The IATF is functionally organized along two major focus areas and several enduring tasks. Major focus area efforts are combating the foreign terrorist network (FTN) and expanding United States Government document and media exploitation (DOMEX) capacity. The IATF's enduring tasks include counter narcoterrorism, threat finance, persistent surveillance requirements, counterterrorism research and analysis, information operations, support to the inter-agency partnership program (IAPP), and time-sensitive planning.

Dr. SNYDER. Colonel Osborne, what role has SOCOM played in implementation of NSPD–44, given its proponency for the civil affairs mission?

Colonel OSBORNE. Civil Affairs (CA) is outside my area of expertise but I believe the USSOCOM role is primarily as a force provider for the Geographic Combatant Commanders. In that capacity we provide trained and equipped Civil Affairs forces to support theater specific plans and operations. Additionally, as the DOD proponent, we are responsible for individual, unit, and institutional training of CA core tasks which are fundamental to stability operations. The U.S. Army John F. Kennedy Special Warfare Center and School at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, is the principle vehicle through which this training is developed and conducted.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MARSHALL

Mr. MARSHALL. Assistant Secretary Vickers, could you name any authors or writings that struck you as especially perceptive insights on how our country should best confront the unconventional global threats it faces?

Mr. VICKERS. I recommend Vali Nasr, Bernard Lewis, Fawas Gerges, and Walid Phares as scholars who offer important insights on the challenges our Nation faces.

Mr. MARSHALL. Admiral Davenport, could you name any authors or writings that struck you as especially perceptive insights on how our country should best confront the unconventional global threat it faces?

Admiral DAVENPORT. We draw ideas from a wide range of academic writings, think-tank monographs, and other informed authors to help understand our problem sets and their potential solutions. Colin Gray is an author that has strongly influenced my thinking as Joint Forces Command (JFCOM) examines ways to deal with the global threat environment. Some of his most significant works include:

– Fighting Talk: Forty Maxims on War, Peace, and Strategy (Apr 07)

– War, Peace, and International Relations: An Introduction to Strategic History (Jul 07)

– "Irregular Warfare: One Nature, Many Characters" *Strategic Studies Quarterly* (Winter 2007).

Additionally, we develop ideas from a wide range of academic white papers, think-tank monographs, and other outside agency sources to help understand our problem sets and their potential solutions. Important source documents that influence our thinking as we examine ways to deal with the global threat environment include:

– More Than Humanitarianism; A Strategic U.S. Approach Toward Africa (January 2006) is a Council on Foreign Relations study chaired by Mr. Anthony Lake and Ms. Christine Todd Whitman. The document views Africa as more than just a charity case and advocates for a strong mix of policies, programs and organizational reforms that will address the broader range of African issues that influence U.S. national interests.

– The Quest For Viable Peace: International Intervention And Strategies For Conflict Transformation (May 2005) was co-authored by Mr. Len Hawley, who has worked with us in JFCOM as a Senior Mentor on numerous projects, and Mr. Jock Covey and Mr. Michael J. Dziedzic. The book reviews the issues involved with nation-building and makes concrete recommendations on rebuilding shattered societies based on the principles of defeating militant extremism, inculcating rule of law, and establishing a political economy that reduces rather than ignites conflict.

– The Beginner's Guide to Nation-Building (2007) is a 330-page RAND monograph done by James Dobbins, Seth G. Jones, Keith Crane, and Beth Cole DeGrasse. As described by RAND, the guide is a ". . . practical 'how-to' manual on the conduct of effective nation-building. It is organized around the constituent elements that make up any nation-building mission: military, police, rule of law, humanitarian relief, governance, economic stabilization, democratization, and development . . . The lessons are drawn principally from 16 U.S.- and UN-led nation-building operations since World War II and from a forthcoming study on European-led missions. In short, this guidebook presents a comprehensive history of best practices in nation-building . . ."

Finally, Joint Forces Command has a very robust professional reading list that I frequently use and regularly refer to. This list contains a wide range of books and articles that provide background and thought provoking analysis on many topics of interest. I have included the list below for your convenience and hope you find it useful:

1. GEN (Ret) Rupert Smith (British Army), *The Utility of Force.* Former deputy SACEUR, commanded the British armored division in the 1991 Gulf War, commanded the U.N. peacekeeping force in Bosnia in 1995 and spent many years in Northern Ireland. In this book he describes the new model of war: "The ends for which we fight are changing from the hard objectives that decide a political outcome to those of establishing conditions in which the outcome may be decided." (2007)

2. Martin Van Creveld, *The Transformation of War.* Van Creveld argues that Clausewitz, whose tenets form the basis for Western strategic thought, is largely irrelevant to nonpolitical wars such as the Islamic jihad and wars for existence such as Israel's Six-Day War. Wars in the future will be waged by terrorists, guerrillas and bandits motivated by fanatical, ideologically-based loyalties; conventional battles will be replaced by skirmishes, bombings and massacres. (1991) *Recommend whole book.*

3. FM 3–24/MCWP 3–33.5. Manual takes a general approach to counterinsurgency operations. The Army and Marine Corps recognize that every insurgency is contextual and presents its own set of challenges. Nonetheless, all use variations of standard themes and adhere to elements of a recognizable revolutionary campaign plan. This manual addresses common characteristics of insurgencies to provide those conducting counterinsurgency campaigns with a solid foundation for understanding and addressing specific insurgencies. (2006) *Recommend whole book.*

4. MG Robert Scales (Ret), *Yellow Smoke.* MG Scales argues that, given Iraq, Afghanistan, and the ongoing war against terrorism, the importance of land warfare seems certain to grow. Despite superiority on almost every front, the U.S. armed forces have been effectively challenged on battlefields near and far. War remains as much art as science and MG Scales offers on example of what to expect if we substitute science and technology wholesale for the understanding of history and humanity. (2003) *Recommend whole book, but could scale to Chapters 1, 2, 7, and 9.*

5. Colin Gray, *Fighting Talk—Forty Maxims on War, Peace, and Strategy.* Gray discusses the nature of strategy, war, and peace, organized around forty maxims. This collection of mini-essays will forearm politicians, soldiers, and the attentive general public against many fallacies that abound in contemporary debates about war, peace, and security. The maxims are grouped into five clusters: War and Peace; Strategy; Military Power and Warfare; Security and Insecurity; and History and the Future. (2007)

6. The National Security Strategy of the United States of America. Available at *http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/2006/nss2006.pdf*

The National Defense Strategy of the United States of America. Available at *http://www.defenselink.mil/news/Apr2005/d20050408strategy.pdf*

The Unified Command Plan (UCP). Available at *http://j5.js.smil.mil/sp/Organization/links/2006%20UCP.pdf* (SIPRNET)

7. GEN (Ret) Gary Luck, "Insights on Joint Operations: The Art and Science" *A Common Perspective* (November 2006). GEN Luck argues that the United States

and its allies are engaged in a protracted global war within a very complex security environment. Our enemies are not only foreign states, but also non-state entities, loosely organized networks with no discernible hierarchical structure. These adversaries can not be defined only in terms of their military capabilities. They must be defined, visualized, and "attacked" more comprehensively, in terms of their interconnected political, military, economic, social, informational, and infrastructure systems. *http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/comm_per/acp14_2.pdf*

8. Lieutenant Colonel David Kilcullen, "Countering Global Insurgency" *Small Wars Journal* (NOV 2004). The paper proposes a new strategic approach to the global War on Terrorism, arguing that the War is best understood as a global insurgency. Therefore counterinsurgency rather than traditional counterterrorism may offer the best approach to defeating global *jihad.* But classical counterinsurgency is designed to defeat insurgency in a single country. Therefore a fundamental reappraisal of counterinsurgency is needed, to develop methods effective against global insurgency. *http://www.smallwarsjournal.com/documents/kilcullen.pdf*

9. George Packer, "Knowing the Enemy: Can Social Scientists Redefine the "War on Terror" *The New Yorker* (18 December 2006). Packer's populist summary of David Kilcullen's thesis (above) "There are elements in human psychological and social makeup that drive what's happening. The Islamic bit is secondary. This is human behavior in an Islamic setting. This is not 'Islamic behavior. . . . People don't get pushed into rebellion by their ideology. They get pulled in by their social networks."

http://www.newyorker.com/archive/2006/12/18/061218fa_fact2

10. Montgomery McFate, "The Military Utility of Understanding Adversary Culture" *Joint Force Quarterly* (JUL 2005). Cultural knowledge and warfare are inextricably bound. Knowledge of one's adversary has been sought since Herodotus studied his opponents' conduct during the Persian Wars (490–479 BC). Although "know thy enemy" is one of the first principles of warfare, our military operations and national security decision-making have consistently suffered due to lack of knowledge of foreign cultures.

http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/jel/jfq_pubs/1038.pdf

11. Advising Foreign Forces: Tactics, Techniques and Procedures—Center for Army Lessons Learned Special Edition No. 06–01 dated January 2006 (requires AKO account). A practical guide for individuals and units to use in preparation for missions as trainers and advisors to foreign military units.

Mr. MARSHALL. General Holmes, could you name any authors or writings that struck you as especially perceptive insights on how our country should best confront the unconventional global threats it faces?

General HOLMES. The following authors and their works influenced my thinking and understanding on Irregular Warfare:

1) All works by Dr. Joseph Nye, Director of JFK School of Government

2) The works, briefings and general writings of Newt Gingrich

3) "Fighting the War of Ideas Like a Real War" by J. Michael Waller

4) The current writings of LTG (ret) David Barno

5) "Multi-Service Concept for Irregular Warfare" by Gen John Mattis, USMC and ADM Eric Olsen, USN

Mr. MARSHALL. General Kearney, could you name any authors or writings that struck you as especially perceptive insights on how our country should best confront the unconventional global threats it faces?

General KEARNEY. The two publications mentioned were "Future Jihad" by Walid Phares and "Faith, Reason, and the War Against Jihadism: A Call to Action" by George Weigel. As noted during the hearing, I think these publications best describe the threat we are facing.

Mr. MARSHALL. Colonel Osborne, could you name any authors or writings that struck you as especially perceptive insights on how our country should best confront the unconventional global threats it faces?

Colonel OSBORNE. During testimony I mentioned two books that I've recently read, "The Utility of Force" by General Sir Rupert Smith and "Infidel" by Ayaan Hirsi Ali. In addition to these two books, I recommend the following books that have contributed to the irregular warfare dialogue: "Information Strategy and Warfare" edited by John Arquilla and Douglas A. Borer, "Warrant for Terror" by Shmuel Bar, "Counterinsurgency in Africa" by John P. Cann, "Counterinsurgency Warfare" by David Galula, "The I.R.A. & Its Enemies" by Peter Hart, and "To Our Great Detriment: Ignoring What Extremists Say About Jihad", a thesis by Stephen Coughlin.

The last book on my list is "The Savage Wars of Peace" by Max Boot. This list is not all inclusive but does represent a good cross section of the current literature.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MRS. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Our O&I subcommittee has investigated training operations currently underway between State Department/USAID and the individual services prior to PRT deployments. Is there any other interagency training going on or planned? Are copies of the curriculum available to Congress?

Ambassador HERBST. The State, USAID, and DOD courses represent the formal training for PRT members at present. In addition, some deploying PRT members have also taken other courses offered at the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute (FSI). S/CRS has worked with FSI since late 2005 in the design and delivery of a reconstruction and stabilization (R&S) training curriculum that currently includes seven courses. These courses cover a range of issues important to reconstruction and stabilization missions (to include the work of PRTs) including R&S assessment and planning and the Interagency Management System for R&S, as well as integration issues among rule of law, infrastructure, transitional security, and governance in an R&S environment. They are all interagency in design and participation. Copies of the course outlines are available.

We are currently working closely with a number of other institutions that are developing courses on R&S including the National Defense University, the Naval Post-Graduate School, and the U.S. Institute of Peace, among others. Their courses will be included in a study on training on complex operations conducted by USIP for the Consortium for Complex Operations that will be published within the next few months and will help guide future training expansion.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. How did this non-PRT type of interagency training develop?

Ambassador HERBST. The State Department's courses on reconstruction and stabilization (R&S) were developed in 2005 by S/CRS and the Foreign Service Institute with an interagency team that included representatives from the U.S. Institute of Peace, USAID, and National Defense University, based on an interagency R&S training strategy. The courses have been continually revised to reflect the latest developments in interagency planning and R&S operations, integrating lessons from experiences in Iraq, Afghanistan, Haiti, and Sudan among others.

This strategy is currently being updated through the NSPD–44 implementation process in a broad interagency effort—the Training, Education, Exercises, and Experimentation Sub-PCC—co-chaired by S/CRS, USAID, and DOD.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Does the Department of State or the Department of Defense need additional authorities to carry out interagency training for Stability and/or Reconstruction Operations? Are there other barriers in law or policy?

Ambassador HERBST. The authorities of the Department of State and those of our partner agencies are currently adequate to allow us to train together. Funding is the immediate barrier to increasing our training cooperation. The FY 2009 budget request for the Civilian Stabilization Initiative would cover our requirements for cooperative course design and delivery, administration, staffing, as well as tuition, travel, and per diem for training participants.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Is it feasible to extend interagency training to the 3,200 Marines scheduled to deploy to Afghanistan later this year?

Ambassador HERBST. Presently this level of unit training is being supported by civilian role players at the National Training Center at Fort Irwin and the Joint Readiness Training Center at Ft Polk. S/CRS is working with the interagency to improve civil-military integration training at the Brigade Task Force level in these venues including Marine mobilization and readiness exercises at Twenty Nine Palms, California.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Has S/CRS examined the Ft. Bragg model for Afghanistan PRT training?

Ambassador HERBST. S/CRS has been a partner and actively involved with the creation and evolution of the Fort Bragg training, from initial efforts to the interagency field assessment conducted this month to inform training planned for fall 2008. This past year, S/CRS briefed PRT military staff, delivered a day-long training on interagency assessment and planning at the Fort Bragg series to the full PRT teams, played a key role in developing the scenarios for the week-long capstone training event, and provided mentors during the exercise itself. In these activities, S/CRS is in support of State's Bureau of South and Central Asian Affairs and USAID's Office of Military Affairs.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. What about for future deployments?

Ambassador HERBST. S/CRS continues to be involved in the Fort Bragg Afghanistan PRT training and is currently participating in development of the next iteration. The lessons from Afghanistan training will be collected through an upcoming interagency PRT Lessons Learned Workshop and during an April training assessment in Kabul. These lessons will be integrated into current planning for predeployment training in future deployments.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Can S/CRS extend Ft. Bragg's model of interagency training for Afghan PRTs to Iraq PRT training, which is now limited to a five day optional course at the Foreign Service Institute and does not train teams together nor does it connect to the BCT that it will work within theater for its Mission Rehearsal exercise?

Ambassador HERBST. Following announcement of the New Way Forward in January 2007, the Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, and other agencies created an interagency PRT training course at the Department of State's Foreign Service Institute in order to provide specialized training for the hundreds of State, DOD, and other agency personnel deploying to Iraq. The State-led Iraq interagency constantly re-evaluates and makes adjustments to PRT training. It is important to note that aside from the name, PRT operations in Iraq and Afghanistan profoundly differ in leadership, structure, staffing, and focus. Because Iraq PRT's do not rotate as a unit, and because not all Iraq PRT's are paired with a Brigade, it is not feasible to replicate the training structure used for Afghanistan. However, we recognize the value of joint civilian-military training and are exploring ways to increase those opportunities. For example, the Iraq PRT inter-agency working group, in which S/CRS regularly participates, recently expanded interagency attendance at the regular Iraq PRT training meeting to, among other objectives, discuss opportunities for military and civilian elements of the PRTs to train together and to support each others' training efforts. S/CRS will continue to support such efforts to share best practices and lessons learned across agencies and across theaters.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MRS. DRAKE

Mrs. DRAKE. I enjoyed visiting Joint Forces Command on many occasions. On one such trip I was given the opportunity to observe the Noble Resolve experiment and I am pleased this work is being down in the Hampton Roads Region. I believe it will help to contribute to the overall preparedness, security and safety of Virginia and our nations. As I understand it, this experiment is heavily focused on interagency cooperation, particularly Homeland Security, and the involvement of the National Guard and FEMA. In your written statement, you state "JFCOM is engaged in a broad array of efforts to improve DOD and interagency integration and capabilities, and is rapidly inserting these improvements into the operating force." Can you explain how Noble Resolve experiments will lead to improved interagency collaboration and coordination? Can you explain what your future plans are for Noble Resolve? Will this experiment expand beyond the Tidewater area?

Admiral DAVENPORT. One of our major focal points for Noble Resolve is information sharing between all elements of national response to threats to and crisis within the homeland—including defense, federal, state and local responders. This line of effort identifies, evaluates, and socializes new technologies, processes, and organizational constructs that overcome barriers to information sharing within DOD as well as between DOD elements and interagency, NGO, and multinational partners. We continue to work closely with USNORTHCOM on establishing a common operational picture that can be shared between all participants in our experimentation events. We're also looking at solutions to the problem of sharing information across security domains, from secret to unclassified systems, etc. We expect information sharing to remain a priority for Joint Experimentation for the foreseeable future.

Our Noble Resolve effort, which is being conducted in direct support of USNORTHCOM, has been focused well beyond the Tidewater area. In 2007, in addition to our work with Virginia, we conducted experimentation with military and civilian organizations in the state of Oregon. In this year's campaign (Noble Resolve 08), we are attempting to raise our level of engagement to better address regional issues. While Noble Resolve 08 work will focus on issues with regional impact, we still engage a limited number of individual states as our actual experiment partners. In 2008, we are working with Virginia, Indiana, Texas, and Oregon. In future work, we will partner with states that are capable and interested in helping address those critical areas of Homeland Defense and Defense Support to Civil Authorities that have been identified for joint experimentation.

Mrs. DRAKE. How much will AFRICOM's efforts toward a "whole of government" target inform your progress toward interagency coordination first envisioned in the joint interagency coordination group (JIACG) concept? Should we expect most of these gains to be material, organizational, or doctrinal in nature?

Admiral DAVENPORT. Joint Forces Command's (JFCOM) efforts at establishing Joint Interagency Coordination Groups (JIACG) at the combatant commands should be seen as an important first step at institutionalizing the concept of "whole of government" into the military planning processes. The interagency groundwork laid by the JIACG program provides a baseline from which both AFRICOM and SOUTHCOM are organizing to exploit the powerful synergy of USG agencies working in alignment toward larger national goals. The proposed AFRICOM structure is another important step in placing "whole of government" thinking into military operations and the larger government as a whole. JFCOM is supporting the development of AFRICOM by facilitating an Interagency Mission Analysis to be completed in a series of workshops/process that illuminate the direction our work is taking:

– Several portions of the Interagency Mission Analysis are being led by the appropriate USG civilian agencies, supported by JFCOM;

– Workshops focus on delineating the roles and responsibilities of AFRICOM and civilian agencies and analyze the challenges that AFRICOM will confront in taking a comprehensive approach to USG planning, programming and implementation and management of activities in Africa.

– The workshops are examining the ways which representatives from various USG Departments and Agencies are assigned to and integrated into the staff in functional roles (as opposed to liaison officers) in the proposed AFRICOM structure.

We expect most of the expected gains in interagency coordination to be seen, first organizationally and then doctrinally, as the new command organizes its staff to develop the structures, processes and procedures to execute its mission in Africa.

○