

IW II

SynGp

MORS
Irregular Warfare II
Workshop
Military Operations Research Society

Synthesis Group Out Briefing

Chair: Michael W. Garrambone, General Dynamics

Co-Chair: Dr. Michael P. Bailey, MCCDC

3 - 6 February 2009

Davis Conference Center

MacDill AFB, Florida



1

BRIEFING INTRODUCTION – Good afternoon. My name is Mike Garrambone and along with my compatriot Dr. Mike Bailey I will provide the Synthesis Group Out Briefing. This is an interesting briefings in that the Synthesis Group bats last in the line up and captures the essence of the previous briefings and adds the perspective of being able to see across working groups and find new and interesting ideas.

- ◆ Introduction
- ◆ Tutorial and Plenary Session
- ◆ Observations
- ◆ Assumptions, Definitions, and Terms
- ◆ Key Issues and Discussion Items
- ◆ Recommendations

I will follow the following agenda beginning with a short introduction and talk about the many things we learned from our tutorial and plenary speakers. I will show you our observations and discuss the state of the assumptions, definitions and term that underpin the key issues and discussions that follow. Finally, we will provide our recommendations based on all the things we learned from you over the span of the workshop.

Mr. Michael W. Garrambone
Dr. Michael P. Bailey

- ◆ **WG 1. Global Engagement**
 - ◆ Mr. Tim Hope
 - ◆ LTC Clark Heidelbaugh
 - ◆ **WG 2. Stability, Security, Transition, & Reconstruction Ops**
 - ◆ Mr. Miles “Doug” Edwards
 - ◆ Dr. Tom Allen
 - ◆ Mr. Billy Sentlinger
 - ◆ **WG 3. Information Ops/Psyops/Social Sciences**
 - ◆ Mr. Kirk Michealson
 - ◆ Dr. Stuart Starr
 - ◆ **WG 4. Counterinsurgency (COIN)**
 - ◆ COL Jeff Appleget
 - ◆ LTC Paul Ewing
 - ◆ **WG 5. Thinking Models About Irregular Warfare**
 - ◆ Mr. Tom Hughes
 - ◆ Ms. Deborah Lott
- ◆ **WG Floating Members**
 - ◆ Mr. Donald Timian
 - ◆ Mr. Greg Keethler
 - ◆ Mr. Leroy Jackson

It is clear that based on the size of the workshop, approximately 186 participants, and the requirement for spanning five working groups at the same time, Mike and I were going to need some help. Using the Noah Algorithm we tried to provide coverage of no less than two SynGp volunteers per working group and a crew of senior “floating” observers to capture information across groups and to detect both common themes and apparent information or organizational gaps.

- ◆ **SynGp Provides**
 - Workshop oversight and objectivity
 - Assistance to working groups in achieving their objectives
 - A perspective across working groups
 - Insights back to working group and workshop chairs
- ◆ **Synthesize**
 - Common themes across groups
 - Identify trouble spots, missing information
 - Highlight gaps between groups and ideas
 - Track critical issues of sponsor interest
- ◆ **Provide Overarching Recommendations**
 - Captures the efforts of five groups
 - Identify their high payoff findings
 - Summarize ideas and recommended actions

For those of you who have not heard about the Synthesis Group (SynGp) you can see that we provide oversight and objectivity to the efforts of the five working groups by joining as active members of working group and by coordinating directly with the working group chairs. The SynGp identifies common themes across groups. We look for trouble spots, missing information and gaps where for instance someone says, “we really don’t know this.” Primarily, the SynGp captures the efforts of the five groups and identifies their high payoff findings. Lastly, we summarize the key ideas and make recommendations on follow-on activities.

- ◆ **Irregular Warfare Joint Operations Concept**
Mr. Jeffery (Gus) Dearolph, Deputy Director Internal
SOCOM J10
- ◆ **Lessons from the Irregular Warfare Methods, Models,**
Techniques
COL Jeff Appleget, TRAC
- ◆ **Summary of Improving Cooperation Among Nations for**
Irregular Warfare Analysis Workshop
Dr. Al Sweetser, Director, OSD-PAE SAC
- ◆ **Systemic Operational Design**
LTC Reb Yancey, SOCOM SORR-J8-Studies
- ◆ **Keynote Speaker**
Mr. William J. A. Miller
Dir, Strategy, Plans, and Policy, SOCOM

We were very fortunate in our workshop to have been supported by five outstanding briefers. We were taught by Mr. Jeffery Dearolph about the Irregular Warfare Joint Operations Concept and by Colonel Jeffery Appleget about the lessons derived from the TRADOC Analysis Center's study on Irregular Warfare Methods, Models and Techniques. Our plenary speaker Dr. Al Sweetser spoke about the very successful first IW workshop held at the Naval Postgraduate School last year and was followed by LTC Reb Yancey who introduced us to the Systemic Operational Design process. Our keynote speaker, Mr. Miller spoke about his perspectives as the SOCOM Director for Strategy, Plans, and Policy.

Initial Tutorial Thoughts

- ◆ Very high level of participation ~ 71 attendees
- ◆ High level of interest in the subject of IW
- ◆ Suggests desire for greater basic understanding
- ◆ Greater need to understand the:
 - IW language
 - IW concepts
 - IW players

Tutorials create knowledge and uniformity

This workshop had a very interesting and significant tutorial setting. With having 71 attendees

- ◆ There is continuing friction with the IW definition across Services, agencies, interagency, and among allies
- ◆ There is a lack of grand strategy and a failure to understand population
- ◆ Key IW factors are: indirect, enduring, persistent, proactive, **population-centric**, respect of legitimate sovereignty linked to over-arching strategy
- ◆ Consists of :
 - Key missions (e.g., FID, UW, COIN, CT, Stab Ops)
 - Key activities (e.g., Strategic communications, IO, PSYOPS, Intel, Counter- intel, Support to law enforcement)
- ◆ IW Military Leadership
 - JFCOM for General Purpose Forces (GPF)
 - SOCOM for Special Operations Forces (SOF)

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

IW II Lessons from the Irregular Warfare SynGp Methods, Models, Techniques COL Jeff Appleget

- ◆ “IW focus is on the population”
- ◆ “COIN” is the Key when insurgents exert more influence on local populations than the national government”
- ◆ IWMmAWG Study established a 7-element framework
 - Identified 35 gaps, 34 related to data and social sciences
- ◆ Analytical Approach
 - Now, Top-down, Western perspective (DIMEFIL-PMESII)
 - Soon, Bottom-up employing social sciences expertise
 - Track strategic level Methods, models, Tools (MmTs)
- ◆ Iterative development of “key data” is central
- ◆ Over-all needs
 - Create credible, relevant MmTs to address decision maker issues
 - Make social scientists integral members of the analysis team
- ◆ Continue community-wide dialogue through IW Working Group



8

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

IW II **Improving Cooperation Among Nations for Irregular Warfare Analysis Workshop (NPS)** **SynGp**
Dr. Al Sweetser, Director, OSD-PAE SAC

- ◆ There is value having international participants from many different nations
- ◆ Emphasized importance of “Whole of Government” approach
- ◆ Useful to conceptualize the problem as “Complex Adaptive Systems” (e.g., act, react, re-react,...)
- ◆ Consider a hybrid approach (e.g., wargame – model – wargame)



WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

IW II Systemic Operational Design (SOD) SynGp LTC Reb Yancey, SOCOM SORR- J8-Studies

- ◆ IW is a “wicked problem”
- ◆ Akin to relearning COIN analysis approaches (Vietnam / Iraq)
- ◆ SOD employs a structured method of inquiry that enables a commander to:
 - Make sense of a complex situation
 - Capture understanding
 - Share the resulting visualization
- ◆ SOD is a method of inquiry, is based on discourse, creates a learning system
- ◆ Requires accepting humility and valuing heresy
- ◆ Means challenging the information and the boss
- ◆ To deal with a dynamical complex system, one needs to explore the interactions among the key parts (“hermeneutics”)



10

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

IW II

**Keynote Speaker
Mr. William J. A. Miller, SOCOM
Dir, Strategy, Plans, & Policy,**

SynGp

- ◆ “IW is about populations”
- ◆ In analyzing IW issues, a Lanchester view is not useful
- ◆ “Behave” not kill our way to victory
Shape vs. exploit, synthesis not analysis, transforming is satisfying whereas solutions are optimizing, presence changes the problem
- ◆ Be as “un-wrong” as can be in conceptualizing a global perspective on issues
- ◆ Globalization challenges and threats to the US—Migration, Crime, Extremism
- ◆ SOCOM Challenges: Be up-stream (leverage), turn down the heat (affect), engage in dialogue with senior decision makers



11

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

Working Group Observations

- ◆ The working groups (WG's) were highly partitioned by their titles and topics areas (tough to find overlap)
- ◆ WG's employed from 4 to 9 presentations in their sessions—a total of 30 different workshop presentations
- ◆ WG's ranged in size from 16 to 50 members—the “modeling IW WG” had the highest numbers
- ◆ WG's recognized that they have more challenges and tasks than they can handle in a three-day workshop
- ◆ WG's have heart and intellectual energy but are limited by clock time and “soak time”
- ◆ WG's would like to “sit in” on other working groups (series vs. parallel information meetings)

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.

General Observations

- ◆ We are still struggling with the exact meaning and breadth of irregular warfare (bounding and characterization)
- ◆ “Models and Tools” do not equal “computer programs and computer models”
- ◆ We are not familiar with the agencies that understand or have jurisdiction for DIMEFIL and PMESII
- ◆ Wargaming with the right players offers a powerful technique for discovery
- ◆ Graphics in a storyboard approach has a prominent place in IW for displaying and understanding influences
- ◆ Everyone is talking about data, its definition, its meaning, its form, who is collecting it, processing it, and storing it
- ◆ No consensus on what information does exist, should exist or who is or should be responsible—regardless, the complexity of the situation transcends the data
- ◆ VV&A is still the topic on IW models and data

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.

- ◆ Line of Effort
- ◆ Systemic Operational Design
- ◆ Adaptive Learning
- ◆ Holistic Analysis
- ◆ Irregular Warfare
- ◆ Periodicity of Reframing
- ◆ Whole of Government
- ◆ Translational Issues
- ◆ ...
- ◆ SSTRO
- ◆ PMESII
- ◆ DIMEFIL
- ◆ GPF
- ◆ MIST
- ◆ MmT
- ◆ NEXUS
- ◆ ATLAS
- ◆ ...

These **three*** items are needed and are hard to find

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ There are no “interagency” people at the workshop and we need input from their areas of expertise
- ◆ We need to invite more people from the Liberal Arts and Social Sciences to help us with our thinking about people/populations
- ◆ We need more tools and methods that go beyond the quantifiable aspects of war
- ◆ Our current metrics don’t capture the qualitative aspects of conflict that commanders need
- ◆ We have voids in our data and very little cause and effect data (e.g., temporal effects require years/decades of observations)
- ◆ There is no “owner” of a common lexicon
- ◆ We lack sufficient analysts/SMEs with DIMEFIL (Diplomatic, Informational, Military, Economic, Financial, Intelligence, Law Enforcement) experience

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ Identifying the differences between “indicators” and “effects” and understanding some effects are not quantifiable (e.g., measuring persuasion and influence)
- ◆ MmT is not ready for Prime Time-- there is no SIMTAX for IW, but there needs to be such a taxonomy that describes the characteristics of these models
- ◆ Should crime, extremism, and migration be considered as “standard” military problems
- ◆ We have not retained our history of IW, how do we bring it back—we need to leverage that operational experience and those earlier insights
- ◆ The value and methodology of reach-back has been questioned as well as the importance of an analyst collecting the data
- ◆ There are different levels of IW that require very different tools

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ There is a gap between our analytical capability and our commander's operational needs
- ◆ The repository of the IW "body of knowledge" has not been clearly identified (IW online Library)
- ◆ There is a relational, supportive, and authority gap between the military and "the interagencies" on IW
- ◆ We do not understand interagency lines of communications
- ◆ We don't understand how to balance government capacity for "restoration of services," security, or economic development
- ◆ We do not know the modeling requirements for IW analysis
- ◆ Many do not know about IW Community Hubs, Potential Data sources or samples of IW Activities available by Joint Data Support

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ **Identify, create and sustain credible IW data**
 - It will require iteration to decide on the data needed
 - Steps must be taken to characterize the data (e.g., metadata; pedigree) and convert it to meet the needs of the analyst
- ◆ **Develop a lexicon of key terms**
 - Current definitions are not acceptable to the interagency, coalition partners
 - New terms must be developed (e.g., “operations against irregular adversaries” Huba Wass de Czege)
- ◆ **Continue the dialogue on MmTs to support IW analyses**
 - This workshop represents a significant step forward
 - More dialogue is needed w/ whole of government participation
- ◆ **MORS convene a IW Joint/Special Session at FLVN**

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.

- ◆ **MORS provide a forum to help organize the needed information**
 - Create a common template to compare and contrast key IW models and tools
 - Continue to support efforts to identify key gaps and priorities to guide future actions
- ◆ **MORS and Sponsors assist in bringing the various IW Communities of Interest (COI) together; e.g.,**
 - IW Working Group
 - MEDEA
 - Human, Social Cultural Behavior (HSCB) modeling
 - MORS Social Science Community of Practice (COP)
- ◆ **Support Service initiatives to put Operations Research Analysts in SOF operational staffs**
- ◆ **Invite more allies and the interagency to these meetings**
- ◆ **Consider MORS IW COP and/or a workshop campaign**

Questions?

**Thank You
For your
Interest**

Objectives at the Tutorials

- ◆ Identify specialized vocabulary (terms of reference)
- ◆ Extract the main learning objectives
- ◆ Pick out the key points within the presentations
- ◆ Look for the burning unresolved issues
- ◆ Identify current weak areas of knowledge
- ◆ Identify follow-on working groups topics

Tutorials create knowledge and uniformity

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

Ms. Renee Carlucci, Deputy Chief, CAA Force Strategy
Mr. Donald Timian, Army Test and Evaluation Command

- ◆ **WG 1. Global Engagement**
 - ◆ Mr. Andy Caldwell (UK) , OSD Policy
 - ◆ Col Thomas Feldhausen, USAF, JCS/J5
- ◆ **WG 2. Stability, Security, Transition, & Reconstruction Ops**
 - ◆ COL Dean Mengel, CAA
 - ◆ Mr. Bill Krondak, TRAC FLVN
- ◆ **WG 3. Information Ops/Psypops/Social Sciences**
 - ◆ Mr. Mike Ottenberg, OSD PA&E SAC
 - ◆ Ms. Karen Gratten, MCCDC OAD
- ◆ **WG 4. Counterinsurgency (COIN)**
 - ◆ Mr. Steve Stephens, MCCDC OAD
 - ◆ LTC Tedd Dugone, Joint Staff, J8 WAD
- ◆ **WG 5. Thinking Models About Irregular Warfare**
 - ◆ Dr. Bob Sheldon, FS, MCCDC OAD
 - ◆ LTC Scott Smith, SOCOM, J8

WORKING GROUP MEMBER INFORMATION (DISCUSSION OF WG MAKEUP, ETC)

Please put the names in alpha order: first name then last name. WG member organizations not necessary unless pertinent to the discussion. If organizations are used for one WG ALL WGs must use the same format.

◆ SynGp Purposes:

- For the WG: Attend, observe, assist, influence, & promote
- For the WS: Observe, gather, record, & create information

◆ SynGp Goals:

- Capture information before, across, and between groups
- Synthesize ideas, fuse concepts, shake loose descriptions
- Identify universals, seams, gaps, vocabulary, direction
- Create distillation, clarity, recommendations, documentation

◆ SynGp Focus

- Tutorials, plenary sessions, WG sessions
- Capture the talking and the thinking

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ Discussions indicate someone went point-to-point to get collaboration with a “whole of government” resource
- ◆ SOD provides a more structured approach to a wicked problem

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.

- ◆ The analytical community has only started to do the reaching out to social scientists in new and novel ways
- ◆ How tactical events can cause strategic effects
- ◆ Resolving the issue of the “disconnect” when we say “data” and “models” to a social scientist
- ◆ How do we open our western philosophical minds to seeing the consequences of our activities in initial or subsequent timeframes
- ◆ Choosing the wrong metric will lead you astray and waste your analytical resources

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ The Army does not include SSTRO in its definition of IW although it is present in all aspects of warfare

WORKING GROUP INTRODUCTION – Please use to give a brief description of WG. Can be used for makeup, largest issue facing the WG or any other important main idea.

- ◆ **There is not a Battlefield Operating System (BOS) type description or functional domain list of data for DIME and PMESII**
- ◆ **Cultural and societal experts are critical to wargaming and so are professional red teams**
- ◆ **We don't know ourselves, that is, all the agencies, jurisdictions, and helping services we need to know**

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.

- ◆ **There is no global list for the sources of information for wargaming**
- ◆ **We are paying lip service to bring social and cultural scientists to wargames and to MORS**
- ◆ **Wargames can be used to help identify model capability gaps and provide insights for operational dynamics**

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.

Key Findings

- ◆ Very limited attention has yet been paid to coalition (international) wargaming
- ◆ Serious difficulties are seen with validity of red/green/? representations (often are blue interpretations of red/green/? behaviors)

- ◆ Inadequate representations of red/green/? players, concepts, and behaviors
- ◆ The wargaming process has not been formalized for irregular warfare
- ◆ Inadequate database of cultural-societal information

WORKING GROUP CHARTER, DIRECTIVES OR AGENDA

This slide can be used in different ways. It can either outline what the WG set out to accomplish or debate, basically giving the WG charter. It can also be used to list the directives of the Workshop Chair to the WG as issues to solve or discuss. Finally, this could be a place just to record the agenda.