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Introduction

Since the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review, the Department of Defense (DOD) has placed a high priority on institutionalizing capabilities-based planning (CBP). In an era of uncertainty, such an approach is helpful for optimizing forces across a broad range of mission sets and within fiscal constraints. Although the department has made some progress in inculcating a capabilities-based culture, it continues to search for a conceptual framework that can drive capabilities-centric force planning, deployment, and posture. As one commentator has noted, “Lost in the proliferation of CBP activities is clarity about the ideas that gave birth to it in the first place and a vision of how to relate it to good decisionmaking.”¹

The conduct of stability operations is a mission area with particular promise for the application of capabilities-based planning. Department of Defense Directive 3000.05, “Military Support for Security, Stabilization, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations,” requires components to give such operations priority comparable to that of combat operations. It also assigns the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the responsibility to “identify stability operations capabilities and assess their development.”² Yet there is no agreed definition of capabilities-based planning, no framework for its use in force development, and no approach to developing outcome metrics to gauge progress. Those within the Defense Department charged with tracking progress on the directive’s implementation have underscored their inability to assess the state of stability operations capabilities development because the joint and interagency community does not yet have a framework for conducting such assessments.³

Recognizing these analytic deficiencies and their real world ramifications, the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Transformation and Resources tasked the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) with developing a capabilities-based framework to generate generic capability packages for future stability operations. The study was conducted from March 2007 through August 2007 and included a scenario-based workshop to test the validity and utility of CBP-derived capability packages. This report delineates CSIS’s findings and recommendations on the project. Chapter 1 describes the study’s overall methodology and analytic framework. Chapter 2 summarizes five stability operations cases examined by the CSIS team and the key insights derived from them, with particular attention to operational and environmental considerations. Chapter 3 sets forth a proposed typology of stability operations and associated measures of success. It concludes with a proposed set of generic

capability packages derived from the typology and metrics. Finally, chapter 4 discusses the findings from the scenario-based workshop, the project’s overall insights into the application of CBP to the stability operations mission set, and key policy and capability considerations for stability operations.
Analytic Framework

Capabilities-based planning is a promising decision-theoretic approach for making resource allocation choices in an uncertain strategic context. To date, however, the Department of Defense lacks a comprehensive capabilities-based framework for developing and selecting among competing capability options. At the request of the Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Force Transformation and Resources, CSIS set out to develop a conceptual framework for capabilities-based force development and then apply it to the stability operations mission set. Stability operations are a particularly interesting model for CBP as they are highly complex, widely variant in their evolution, and involve the participation of many actors beyond the Department of Defense, both on and off the “battlefield.”

This chapter begins with a summary and assessment of the Department of Defense’s current approach to capabilities-based planning and to stability operations. It describes CSIS’s proposed three-part, capabilities-based methodology for developing capability packages.

DOD’s CBP Approach

Capabilities-based approaches, under a variety of names, are widely used in business and in government. For defense planners, capabilities-based planning harkens back to the original intent of the Planning, Programming, and Budgeting System, in which the goal was to select the right combination of inputs to achieve desired system-wide outcomes.1 In 2001, the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) introduced the concept of capabilities-based planning to a wider audience. The 2001 QDR describes the capabilities-based model as “one that focuses more on how an adversary might fight than who the adversary might be and where a war might occur.”2 Yet it also describes the model as follows:

A capabilities-based model…requires identifying capabilities that U.S. military forces will need to deter and defeat adversaries who will rely on surprise, deception, and asymmetric warfare to achieve their objectives. Moving to a capabilities-based force also requires the United States to focus on emerging opportunities that certain capabilities, including advanced remote sensing, long-range precision strike, transformed maneuver, and expeditionary forces and systems, to overcome anti-access and area denial threats, can confer on the U.S. military over time.3

---

3 Ibid., p. 14.
In describing CBP in these ways, the 2001 QDR raised more questions than answers about its new analytic approach and its implications. In DOD today, CBP is still used to describe two different kinds of analyses: those that define the environment in which the United States must operate (challenges) and those that define its requisite capabilities (needs). The conflation of these “red” and “blue” definitions, respectively, has created significant confusion over capabilities-based approaches. Adding to the confusion is QDR language contrasting CBP with so-called threat-based planning. Many interpreted this attempted dichotomy to mean that capabilities-based approaches should not rely on actual threat projections. This is hardly the case, as we will demonstrate below. Nevertheless, the confusion resulted in initial senior-level resistance to the use of threat information in analysis and later in institutional backlash to CBP on the assumption that it was devoid of any relation to anticipated adversaries. Efforts to implement CBP continue to suffer from these differing yet equally destructive perceptions.

Since the 2001 QDR, the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Staff have attempted to implement CBP through a variety of processes and plans. Their efforts are not guided by any official direction to the department on capabilities-based planning or its elements. There is no single DOD directive or instruction that defines CBP or guides its implementation. There is likewise no single institutional advocate for defining, explaining, or ensuring the promotion of CBP. Today, the Joint Staff Force Structure, Resources, and Assessment Directorate, J-8, is perhaps the most active DOD advocate for capabilities-based planning. It oversees the Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS), the most extensive CBP-related effort to date. Figure 1 illustrates the six key sets of activities that J-8 believes comprise CBP: strategic guidance, the analytic agenda, joint concept development and experimentation, JCIDS, the DOD acquisition process, and the planning, programming, budgeting and execution system. In each of these areas, the Department of Defense is undertaking efforts to improve alignment of plans, programs, and budgets to strategy. The common theme that identifies them as CBP is their emphasis on assessing the defense program according to the needs of the current and future joint warfighter. CSIS’s proposed framework for capabilities-based approaches, detailed at the end of this chapter, echoes this theme.

---

4 JCIDS assists the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in identifying, assessing, and prioritizing joint military capability needs. See Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, “Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System,” CJCSI 3170.01E, May 11, 2005.
State of Planning for Stability Operations

The United States has long been involved in operations intended to stabilize other nations, either following conflict or in the hopes of averting conflict. In 2005, the deputy secretary of defense issued DOD Directive 3000.05, which required DOD components to give priority to stability operations “comparable to combat operations” and to integrate stability operations in all relevant plans and processes. This pivotal directive broadly defines stability operations as “military and civilian operations conducted across the spectrum from peace to conflict to establish or maintain order in States and regions.”

The U.S. Army’s Field Manual 3.0 specifies a range of military operations that the army considers within the stability rubric. These include peace operations, foreign internal defense, security assistance, humanitarian and civic assistance, support to insurgencies, support to counterdrug operations, combating terrorism, noncombatant evacuation operations, arms control, and shows of force. This field manual is currently undergoing an update, as is the Joint Operational Concept for Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations (SSTRO). Figure 2

---

7 Ibid.
provides a comparison of how the Department of State’s Office of the Coordinator for Stabilization and Reconstruction (S/CRS), the Department of Defense, and the U.S. Army, currently conceive of military stability operations tasks.

Figure 2. Evolving Perspectives on the Stability Operations Mission Set

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Department: Essential Tasks Matrix</th>
<th>Defense Department: StabOps Joint Operating Concept</th>
<th>U.S. Army: Stability Tasks Draft FM 3-0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Safe &amp; Secure Environment</td>
<td>Civil Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice &amp; Reconciliation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Civil Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Participation</td>
<td>Representative, Effective Government</td>
<td>Support to Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Stabilization &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure &amp; Essential Services</td>
<td>Support Economic Infrastructure Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance &amp; Social Well-being</td>
<td>Humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>Provision of Essential Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However defined, for many years the stability operations mission set was, at best, a secondary consideration in analytic efforts to size and shape U.S. military forces. The 1987 establishment of U.S. Special Operations Command, the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Special Operations and Low Intensity Conflict, and Major Force Program-11 for the exclusive funding of special operations and low-intensity conflict missions elevated congressional and DOD recognition of the problem set. It also allowed the services, particularly the army, to view the mission set as relevant only for special operations forces. In the ensuing five years, encompassing the end of the Cold War and the onset of the major-theater war force planning construct, the Department of Defense continued to focus on major combat capabilities and, to a much lesser extent, “forward presence” operations aimed at deterring potential opportunists and garnering goodwill. But U.S. military experience in the 1990s—in Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, and East Timor—belied the assumption that capabilities for stability operations were simply a subset of those already under development for theater

---


warfare or presence. The belief that regular military forces would not be required to perform stability operations missions also proved to be misguided. Department of Defense strategy, as articulated through a succession of quadrennial defense reviews, gradually took increasing account of stability operations. The following excerpts exemplify evolving DOD views on the subject.

- **1993 Bottom-up Review.** “While deterring and defeating major regional aggression will be the most demanding requirement of the new defense strategy…US military forces are more likely to be involved in operations short of declared or intense warfare…Fortunately the military capabilities needed for these operations are largely those maintained for other purposes—major regional conflicts and overseas presence. Thus, although specialized training and equipment may often be needed, the forces required will, for the most part, be selected elements of those general purpose forces maintained for other, larger military operations.”12

- **1997 Quadrennial Defense Review.** “Based on recent experience and intelligence projections, the demand for smaller-scale contingency operations is expected to remain high over the next 15 to 20 years…These operations will still likely pose the most frequent challenge for U.S. forces through 2015 and may require significant commitments of forces, both active and Reserve.”13

> “[E]xtensive analysis of smaller-scale contingencies provided us with insights which helped shape the QDR force and also made clear that there is much work still to be done in assessing the impact and managing the demand of smaller-scale contingencies on our forces.”14

- **2001 Quadrennial Defense Review.** “Over time, substantial commitments to multiple concurrent smaller-scale contingency operations will certainly stress U.S. forces in ways that must be carefully managed. Smaller-scale contingency operations will also put a premium on the ability of the U.S. military to work effectively with other U.S. government agencies, nongovernmental organizations, private voluntary organizations, and a variety of coalition partners…U.S. forces must be multi-mission capable and they must be organized, trained, equipped, and managed with multiple missions in mind.”15

- **2006 Quadrennial Defense Review.** “In the past, major elements of the forces were designed and evaluated against a narrow set of military missions and associated tasks. With a wider set of missions and tasks, the measurement of operational risk will consider both the missions that forces were designed to accomplish, and those they are currently assigned to conduct.”16

---

14 Ibid., pp. 23–24.
“The future force…must have far greater endurance. It must be trained, ready to operate and able to make decisions in traditionally non-military areas, such as disaster response and stabilization.”

The progression of these strategic statements evidences the slow dawning of conviction that DOD needs to plan specifically for stability operations when developing future forces. The 2005 SSTR Directive continues this trend by assigning to the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the responsibility to “identify stability operations capabilities and assess their development.” To date, progress in fulfilling this direction has been only modest across the joint force.

A Proposed CBP Framework for Stability Operations

Given the inchoate state of joint capability analysis, the likely prevalence of stability operations into the future, and the Defense Department’s continuing desire to institutionalize capabilities-based approaches, CSIS set out to create a capabilities-based force development methodology and test its utility on the SSTR mission set. For purposes of this study, CSIS defined capabilities-based planning as an approach to managing risk, in a resource-constrained and uncertain environment, through a mix of capabilities best suited to the projected range of operational needs.

The study methodology was composed of three major elements:

- Developing a typology of generic stability operations, using case study insights;
- Key Study Assumptions
  - Capabilities-based planning is an important aspect of defense transformation.
  - The Department of Defense will continue to inculcate capabilities-based planning methods in its various processes.
  - Stability operations constitute a continuing U.S. mission to which the U.S. military will need to contribute.
  - Defense capabilities for stability operations will be critical to the joint warfighter into the foreseeable future.
  - Stability operations will require close integration between military and civilian, government and nongovernment, and foreign and U.S. elements.

17 Ibid., p. 75.
18 DOD Directive 3000.05, p. 8.
19 Individually, the services have done some analysis along these lines already. The U.S. Army and its Center for Army Analysis have been particularly active in analyzing capabilities and forces needed for stability operations.
20 Definitions for the key terms used by CSIS in this study are provided in appendix A.
- Identifying key metrics by which to measure mission success across that typology; and
- Creating a scenario-based process to test the efficacy of different capability packages for the future.

Because stability operations are inherently multidimensional, involving military, diplomatic, information, and economic tools, the CSIS methodology takes a broad, whole-of-government and coalition approach to determining capability needs.

It bears emphasizing that the above methodology and its application differ from popular perceptions about capabilities-based planning. Planners have always relied on two fundamental sources of information for developing forces: first, historical or ongoing operations, if any analogies can be found; second, good information or intelligence about likely future adversaries, partners, and the expected operational environments. The former can be very useful in approximating needed capabilities for a particular type of mission. The latter is critical if doctrine and capability are to evolve or be transformed effectively. Despite perceptions to the contrary, good capabilities-based planning, like prior approaches, relies on these two sources of force planning information. The range of prior experience and future threats considered in capabilities-based approaches, however, is generally broader than that used during the Cold War or its immediate aftermath. Further, the capabilities-based approach emphasizes outcomes, measured in meeting operational needs, over inputs, typically measured in numbers and types of discrete programs or platforms. The study methodology reflects these two hallmark characteristics of capabilities-based approaches: determining needs by evaluating a broad range of past and potential future scenarios and describing those needs in terms of outcomes, avoiding a premature fixation on specific solutions.

The next chapter provides a summary of the historical and ongoing stability operations CSIS examined as part of its typology-to-capabilities development process. Chapter 3 will then lay out the stability operations typology, metrics, and associated capability sets that these cases suggested to the CSIS analysts. It will conclude with a description of the process by which the team tested the study framework against a future stability operations scenario. Chapter 4 concludes with study insights for both the tested capabilities-based planning method and the future conduct of stability operations.
Insights from Case Studies

In order to develop a typology of stability operations, key performance measures, and associated capability packages, the CSIS team assessed a number of historical or ongoing stability operations with an emphasis on gleaning key insights into environmental and operational considerations for their conduct. The five cases examined were:

- Afghanistan
- Combined Joint Task Force–Horn of Africa (CJTF-HOA)
- East Asian Tsunami relief
- Haiti
- Kosovo

In selecting these five cases, the CSIS team sought to probe a wide spectrum of variables relating to stability operations. Missions represented in these operations include humanitarian assistance/disaster relief, peace operations, counterterrorism/security assistance, noncombatant evacuation, and rebuilding of indigenous institutions. The operations varied widely in mission intensity\(^1\) and duration.\(^2\) They span four continents and are representative of U.S. thinking before, during, and after the deputy secretary of defense issued DOD 3000.05. The stability operations cases also required differing levels of resources, troops, equipment, civilian involvement, interagency collaboration, international engagement, and public support.\(^3\) Taken together, this sample set of cases painted a complex and comprehensive composite of U.S. contributions to modern stability operations.

This chapter distills the research team’s insights from these case studies and provides summary information about each operation. At the strategic, operational, and tactical levels, the case studies illuminate key determinates of stability operations planning, with respect to both environmental and operational factors. Among the key environmental factors are the following:

---

1 The intensity of the case studies ranged significantly. At the low end, CJTF-HOA operations started with 800 troops and currently involve about 1,700 personnel, and in Kosovo, 4,000 troops executed the U.S. mission in 1999. In the middle range, the United States had 20,000 troops in Haiti, ultimately drawn down to 10,000; the Tsunami relief began with 9,500 troops and reached its maximum deployment at 15,000. The highest intensity operation in the case set was Afghanistan, starting with 15,000 troops in 2001 and reaching 30,000 in 2007.

2 The case studies also represented a wide range of durations, with Kosovo (1999–present) and Afghanistan (2001–present) as the longest. Operations in the Horn of Africa have lasted third longest—from 2003 to the present. The Haitian and Tsunami response efforts were both relatively short, lasting 1.5 and 6 months, respectively.

3 To gather this information, the CSIS team’s case study template addressed objectives, strategies, missions/tasks, ends-ways-means relationships—and how each changed over the course of the operation—for the United States, United Nations, partners, and adversaries.
Permissiveness, both at entry and throughout operations; 
- Presence of U.S. or allied forces in the region prior to crisis; and 
- Surprise of crisis to the United States, the target population, and other key players.

Critical operational factors include:
- Centers of gravity;
- Decisive points, to the extent they can be foreseen;
- Potential wild cards, particularly how they might affect decisive points and centers of gravity; and
- Cooperation and assistance from international and interagency partners.

Below are CSIS’s key insights in each of these areas.

Environmental Factors

Permissiveness
Chief among environmental factors affecting needed U.S. capabilities for stability operations is permissiveness. Permissiveness is determined by the level of hostility that U.S. personnel encounter during entry or at any other time during an operation.

Stability operations in Afghanistan, the Horn of Africa, and Kosovo were all conducted in semi-permissive environments, both at the time of entry and throughout the operation. In the case of Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti, U.S. and multinational forces entered into a semi-permissive environment and expected it to persist. Yet enemy resistance never materialized, and the United States conducted the remainder of its mission in a permissive state.4

The East Asian Tsunami relief effort constituted the only true case of permissiveness among the five stability operations. To be sure, the operation occurred in a region previously home to considerable hostility, and there were isolated threats to U.S. troops. But U.S. planners mitigated these potential risks and enhanced force protection by establishing a very small land footprint and sea basing the vast majority of soldiers.5 As a consequence, the United States preserved the permissive environment.

The insights gleaned from these experiences clearly illustrate that permissiveness is a dynamic—not static—variable in stability operations.

---

4 To prepare, DOD had produced two invasion plans, one for an invasion with “offensive violence inflicted suddenly, from air and sea, with overwhelming but appropriate force” and another for peaceful entry. For more on the surprisingly permissive state during the two-year U.S. intervention, see James Dobbins et al., America’s Role in Nation-Building: From Germany to Iraq, (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, 2003), p. 137.

Planners expecting a permissive environment may instead find troops in a suddenly nonpermissive one or vice versa. As the Haitian case illustrates, uncertainty requires planners to prepare multiple options for many contingencies. And as the East Asian Tsunami case illustrates, prudent planning can help turn a potentially dangerous environment into a peaceful one. Capability packages, therefore, should be sufficiently diversified and flexible to allow deployed forces to accomplish their missions at varying levels of permissiveness.

**Presence of U.S. or Allied Forces in the Region Prior to Crisis**

Another key environmental factor in stability operations is the level at which the U.S. government or its allies, particularly their military forces, have previously been engaged in the region. Defense involvement can take many forms, including joint war games, military training programs, troop exchanges, intelligence sharing agreements and so forth. \(^6\) Regardless of the specific type of engagement, however, the cases suggest that some level of existing presence is helpful in setting the groundwork for successful stability operations missions—and even for preventing some from ever occurring.

In three of the five cases, the U.S. military or its allies had a presence either on the ground or nearby. In Kosovo, prior regional engagement allowed NATO to prepare for its post-conflict role several months in advance of deployment. Thus, troops that were already staged in Macedonia started moving just hours after receiving orders to enter Serbia. In contrast, the United Nations had only a few days to prepare its Kosovo presence and subsequently took months to ramp up to full capacity. \(^7\)

In the East Asian Tsunami relief effort, although the United States did not have strong ties with all of the affected countries—most notably Indonesia—U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM) capitalized on the many relationships it had recently cultivated among Indian Ocean nations, notably Sri Lanka and Thailand. \(^8\) In fact, just one year before the tsunami struck, the U.S. military had participated in a war game with countries in that region to exercise their joint response to a humanitarian assistance/disaster relief scenario. When the tsunami struck in 2004, this shared preparation paved the way for a highly coordinated response. \(^9\)

Contrastingly, neither the United States nor its allies had substantial levels of engagement in Afghanistan or the Horn of Africa before beginning stability operations in those regions. In fact, before eventually moving onshore in Djibouti, U.S. troops in the Horn of Africa were initially housed aboard the amphibious command ship *Mount Whitney* because the United States had not operated a base anywhere in Africa since U.S. forces left Somalia in 1994. \(^10\) This absence in the

---

\(^6\) This attribute is intentionally discussed separately from civilian involvement. That subject receives separate treatment in the “operational factors” section of this report.

\(^7\) Dobbins et al., *America’s Role in Nation-Building*, p. 116.

\(^8\) Admiral Thomas B. Fargo (USN), U.S. Pacific Command media roundtable transcript, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, January 20, 2005.

\(^9\) Ibid.

Horn of Africa meant that prior to 2003 the United States was without eyes and ears in a region purportedly of prime interest to al Qaeda. Today, CJTF-HOA routinely dispatches civil affairs teams to roam freely and build relationships with locals, in hopes that gaining the trust of citizens will lead to improved intelligence collection capabilities.

In sum, the smooth Kosovo NATO deployment and international East Asian Tsunami relief efforts contrast with the United States’ ongoing efforts to gain visibility in the Horn of Africa after a decade of absence. This suggests that prior regional engagement can reduce the learning curve associated with conducting a particular stability operation. Moreover, it also suggests that an established U.S. or allied regional presence may diminish the likelihood of crises requiring stability operations.

**Surprise of Crisis to the United States, the Target Population, and Other Key Players**

The element of surprise is a central tenet of traditional warfare, owing to the truism that a flatfooted enemy is generally a disadvantaged one. An examination of the five case studies yielded few examples of U.S. or coalition forces using surprise to gain strategic advantage. Afghanistan proved to be one case in which the U.S. military sought and achieved surprise both operationally and tactically, and it did so to its distinct advantage.

On the other hand, U.S. or allied planners are sometimes the ones most surprised by the outbreak of crises that require the start of stability operations. A U.S. or allied presence in a region can sometimes mitigate these surprises, providing planners with a level of regional awareness before a situation escalates. But some stability operations—such as disaster responses—are largely unpredictable. In these missions, a lack of reliable ground truth often compounds U.S. difficulties. In the East Asian Tsunami relief effort, for instance, initial deployment of U.S. capabilities was limited by the military’s inability to obtain information regarding the magnitude of the disaster and the unique requirements of the affected nations. Due to a bevy of factors, including weather, lack of people on the ground, poor geospatial encyclopedic information, and the sheer magnitude of the disaster, it took several weeks “to attain a reliable picture of the situation on the ground.” Meanwhile, planners used commercial imagery and other open sources, such as accounts from individual citizens on the Internet, to provide timely information.

---

The uncertainty surrounding all three of these environmental factors—permissiveness, preexisting presence or access, and warning of a precipitating occurrence—naturally drive the United States to a capabilities-based approach for stability operations. As the cases illuminate, the United States has frequently needed to orchestrate a swift response to an evolving crisis for which no prior specific planning has occurred.
Operational Factors

Center of Gravity
Perhaps no operational factors are more critical to stability operations than their centers of gravity. A center of gravity is defined as the source of power that provides freedom of action, physical strength, and will to fight.\textsuperscript{14} In the case studies, host nation sovereignty, domestic political forces, and public support emerged as recurring centers of gravity. Specifically, missions in Afghanistan, Kosovo, and the East Asian Tsunami response all derived power from the host nation’s ability to establish and/or maintain sovereignty for itself and its citizens.

In Afghanistan, the U.S. center of gravity came in the form of the Karzai government’s ability to establish the rule of law and govern. At times, this has proved a difficult process, as “corruption and other internal weaknesses…caused an erosion of such popular support for Afghanistan’s national government.”\textsuperscript{15} The government, therefore, must continue to make strides in extending government services or risk losing the support of its citizens and the international community.\textsuperscript{16} And in the East Asian Tsunami response effort, the U.S. center of gravity was the maintenance of sovereignty and assertive control over the relief efforts by the host nations, even if that meant casting the United States and other allies as supporting actors.

The importance of maintaining American public support for an operation constituted a critical U.S. center of gravity. Several of the operations analyzed by the study team had tenuous or wavering domestic support for U.S. military action. In Kosovo, where the US public gave only marginal support for military action—and a majority disapproved of a land assault—rising casualties or perceived mission failure would have turned the public tide against the war. In Haiti, public support in the wake of Mogadishu was so fractured that a shift in congressional power seven weeks after the start of Operation Uphold Democracy led to a congressionally mandated reduction in funding and an increase in oversight.

Decisive Points
Stability operations often turn on a handful of decisive points at which momentum shifts in favor of success or failure.\textsuperscript{17} To the extent that planners can predict these events, decisions, or insights, they can prepare and allocate resources appropriately. But much like a sports game—in which many plays occur but only

\textsuperscript{14} Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, \textit{Joint Publication 3-0: Joint Operations} (Washington, D.C.: DOD, September 17, 2006), p. IV-10.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{17} For an extended discussion of decisive points and their relationship to centers of gravity, see Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, \textit{Joint Publication 3-0}, pp. IV-11–IV-12.
CASE STUDY: COMBINED JOINT TASK FORCE–HORN OF AFRICA

Timeframe
2003–Present

U.S. Objectives
- Prevent terrorists—specifically al Qaeda—from fleeing U.S. attacks in Afghanistan/Pakistan and seeking sanctuary in Horn of Africa (HOA)
- Interdict terrorist groups already operating in HOA
- Detect, disrupt, and defeat terrorists posing an imminent threat
- Establish regional stability: transform ungoverned spaces in HOA into areas that are inhospitable to terrorists

U.S. Strategy
- Build host nation military capacity to combat terrorism
- Build relationships and win hearts and minds by conducting humanitarian capacity building missions

Key U.S. Missions
- Develop force posture capable of deterring/interdicting terrorist threats
- Conduct direct action operations
- Conduct military-to-military training
- Conduct civil-military operations
- Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance

Assessment of Ends-Ways-Means Relationship
- Expanded access, presence, and engagement in HOA
- Expanded civil military operations/military-to-military activities
- Increased host nation capacity: Yemen, Ethiopia, Kenya, Djibouti
- Building relationships with host nation military/nonmilitary leadership
- Lack of State/USAID capacity and/or willingness to facilitate CJTF-HOA
- Question of whether United States is achieving sustainable development
- Short deployment times/training periods hinder continuity/institutional memory
- Perceived competition for CENTCOM attention/resources (due to Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom)
- Question whether United States needs larger footprint

Force Structure
- Approximately 1,500 U.S. troops: roughly 450 navy, army, marine; slightly fewer air force
- Civil affairs teams/military-to-military training teams/Special Operations Forces
- Combined Joint Task Force commanded by navy admiral
- Small number of foreign military advisers
- Works with Combined Task Force-150 and Joint Special Operations Task Force–HOA
- Small, uncoordinated U.S. government interagency involvement
a few directly shape the outcome of the contest—the tipping points in military operations can be difficult if not impossible to predict.

The decisive points among the five stability operations case studies fell roughly into two categories: those occurring before troops arrived in the area of operations and those relating to a change of strategies/tactics during the operation. In the former category, Jimmy Carter, Colin Powell, and Sam Nunn’s successful last-minute diplomatic mission to Haiti helped secure a peaceful entry for U.S. troops. Similarly, in the East Asian Tsunami relief effort, the U.S. Pacific Command deployed several naval vessels to the affected area in advance of the president’s orders, shaving several days off the response time and saving an untold number of lives. The U.S. decision at the outset of the relief effort to sea base most of its troops rather than house them on land preserved host nation sovereignty and reduced the exposure of U.S. forces to potential threats.

The case studies also revealed several decisive points arising in the midst of ongoing operations, particularly in direct response to an opponent’s shift in strategies or tactics. In Afghanistan, the Taliban’s employment of insurgent-style tactics forced the United States to adjust its strategy accordingly. In the Horn of Africa, the lack of a visible al Qaeda presence led the United States to shift from pursuing a strict counterterrorism approach to one employing a mix of counterterrorism and stability operations, forecasting in many ways the need for new counterinsurgency doctrine.

Potential Wild Cards

Wild cards, which are unanticipated events that critically influence an operation’s outcome, are prevalent both in conventional wars and in the complex, irregular environment of stability operations. Wild cards can significantly affect other operational factors. They can serve as decisive points and can even alter centers of gravity. The CSIS team identified wild cards for each case study, which, true to their definition, followed no predictable pattern.

- In Afghanistan, the fates of key figures such as President Hamid Karzai and Taliban leader Mullah Omar remain the most significant wild cards. Without Karzai’s leadership, the United States and NATO would face the real prospect of the Afghan government—and the entire country—falling into irreversible turmoil and unrest. Omar’s capture or death might cause a fractionalization of remaining Taliban fighters or serve to bring further support to their cause, with unknown consequences for the allied effort.
- The East Asian Tsunami response had two wild cards: the U.S. inability to gain adequate intelligence in the days and weeks following the disaster; and the presence of American assets that happened to be passing through the area when the disaster struck, enabling a relatively rapid response. The potential
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for the environment to shift from permissive to nonpermissive was a third wild card that fortunately did not materialize.

- In Haiti, the outcome of the Carter-Nunn-Powell diplomatic mission, the unhelpful behavior of President Jean Bertrand Aristide, and changing perceptions of the U.S. presence—from liberators to potential collaborators—all emerged as wild cards.

- Wild cards in the ongoing CJTF-HOA operation include the degree of actual al Qaeda presence in the region and the possibility for major casualties that might cause the United States to rethink its mission there.

- In Kosovo, the most influential wild card was the outbreak of civil unrest in 2004. A wild card possibility that did not materialize was Federal Republic of Yugoslavia forces engaging NATO forces in combat.

**Interagency and International Cooperation**

The effective conduct of stability operations can create significant resource burdens, requiring interagency and international coordination among a wide range of actors, including allies, international organizations, and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). In the case studies examined here, interagency and international collaboration had an enormously positive influence on mission success, generating critical economies of scale in several missions.

Among the five case studies, the East Asian Tsunami relief effort may constitute the best example of effective international and interagency coordination. In Washington, an Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Asian Tsunami Task Force worked with PACOM to coordinate military efforts, while an interagency committee coordinated the overall federal response with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)—specifically the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance—at the helm. On the ground, three regional combined support groups (CSGs) served as the central node of the U.S. government response, linking country teams with host nations and international organizations.

Internationally, the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs led the UN relief effort. Within one day of the tsunami, the United Nations had country teams working in the affected areas and coordinating with host nations. Coalition and host nations did their part as well. During peak operations, 21 participating nations provided a total of 102 ships, 104 helicopters, and 92 fixed-
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**CASE STUDY: EAST ASIAN TSUNAMI**

**Timeframe**
December 2004–February 2005

**U.S. Objectives**
- Minimize loss of life/human suffering of displaced persons
- The scope of the crisis no longer exceeds host nation capacity
- All U.S. personnel are redeployed to home station

**U.S. Strategy**
- Conduct only essential, life-sustaining operations
- Support host nation relief efforts while not overshadowing or appearing to overshadow host nation sovereignty
- Win hearts and minds in a region of strategic importance

**Key U.S. Missions**
- Conduct search and rescue missions, as necessary
- Provide assets (especially helicopters) capable of reaching hardest hit areas
- Offer supplies (food, water, medicine) to entire area of responsibility
- Force protection

**Assessment of Ends-ways-means Relationship**
- Success story: United States leveraged entire government resources to conduct relief operations
- U.S. military accomplished all of its stated objectives
- Mission benefited from PACOM’s strong relationships with nations in the region
- Strong U.S. government interagency coordination
- Lack of reliable information in early stages hindered deployment
- Some criticism of U.S. response as slow
- United States brought critical assets to the operation (helicopters, USNS Mercy)
- Air contingency response much more efficient than ground deployment

**Force Structure**
- Approximately 15,000 U.S. troops
- Majority of troops were sea based
- Most troops based with Abraham Lincoln Strike Group and Expeditionary Strike Group
- Combines Strike Force commanded by Marine general
- Major U.S. government interagency response
- Key U.S. military assets:
  - 25 ships
  - 45 planes
  - 57 helicopters
wing aircraft to the tsunami relief efforts.\textsuperscript{23} They also contributed an estimated 30,000 troops.\textsuperscript{24} In Afghanistan, lack of agreement over where to expand the international area of responsibility and over how each country’s troops would be used to do so gave birth to the provincial reconstruction team (PRT) model.\textsuperscript{25} Over four years after its inception, the United States today runs 12 of the 25 PRTs in Afghanistan, which are staffed with officials from the Departments of State, Agriculture, and Treasury, in addition to military personnel. According to one analyst, “They are intended to support the development of a more-secure environment in the provinces; facilitate cooperation between the Afghan interim authority, civilian organizations, and the military; and strengthen the Afghan government’s influence through interaction with regional political, military, and community leaders.”\textsuperscript{26} The creation and use of PRTs have pointed out many flaws in interagency collaboration, even as they promise success. For instance, in recent months the Department of State has struggled to recruit civilians who are willing to serve on these teams. PRTs nonetheless demonstrate the potential advantages of interagency and international coordination for stabilization and reconstruction.\textsuperscript{27}

Unfortunately, the East Asian Tsunami response and the Afghanistan PRT models are unique among the case studies in their extensive international and interagency coordination. In some other cases examined, U.S. government efforts appeared uncoordinated, with DOD either working in a region independently, or working in a region alongside civilian agencies without a sense of what each department is contributing. Exemplifying this lack of coordination, agencies’ operations in the Horn of Africa today appear autonomous and strategically uncoordinated. In the first years of CJTF-HOA, the task force commander shuttled from country to country with virtually no embassy involvement, building alliances among national and local leaders to garner support for his task force’s mission.\textsuperscript{28} In the field, a variation of the same story rang true, with civil affairs officers roaming the region and building relationships among civic leaders and citizens with little to no coordination with high-level foreign officials.

\textsuperscript{25} Dobbins et al., America’s Role in Nation-Building, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{26} Ibid., p. 137.
\textsuperscript{27} Some of the criticism centers on how provincial reconstruction teams (PRTs) have been applied to Iraqi reconstruction, which is markedly different than in Afghanistan, a phenomena clearly described by Robert M. Perito in Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Iraq (Washington, D.C.: USIP, 2007), pp. 1–12, and in The U.S. Experience with Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan (Washington, D.C.: USIP, 2005), pp. 1–16. For more information on struggles to recruit civilians for PRTs, see Rajiv Chandrasekaran, “Iraq Rebuilding Short on Qualified Civilians,” Washington Post, February 24, 2007.
\textsuperscript{28} The resuscitation of this story, first noted in Daniel Danelo, “Around the Horn,” U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings 132 (2006): 21, makes no judgment regarding whether fault lies with the Defense Department State Department or neither organization for the lack of coordination of meetings with high-level foreign officials.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study: Haiti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Timeframe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Objectives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Establish and maintain a secure environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deploy forces quickly and execute rapid entry of forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Control Port-au-Prince and Cap Haitien; control the countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Return President Aristide to power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Maintain the initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stand up a Haitian public security force and ensure unity of effort before turning the operation over to the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Return the government of Haiti to a “proper functioning” state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Strategy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Occupy the port and airfield at Cap Haitien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ensure airport and port security operations and city security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Initiate operations in outlying areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Execute partial redeployment of forces in accordance with transition to UNMIH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key U.S. Missions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Train the Haitian National Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weapons control (in capital, out of sector, and mountain strikes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Force protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Deterrence through force presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Civil affairs and psychological operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Disease prevention and soldier medical protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment of Ends-ways-means Relationship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Success in restoring President Aristide to power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Failure to achieve a “tipping point” at which Haitians provided essential government services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Ambiguity over end state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Marginalized international cooperation (CARICOM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Overemphasis on force protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Lack of cultural understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Force Structure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Approximately 20,000 U.S. troops initially deployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Joint Special Operations Task Force composed of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Army Rangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Army Special Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Marines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ Navy SEALs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Significant buildup of U.S. civilian presence following initial deployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ DOD Contractors (Brown and Root Services Corp.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▫ U.S. Police Monitors and UNMIH support and liaison personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CASE STUDY: KOSOVO**

**Timeframe**
1999–Present

**U.S. Objectives**
- Deter renewed hostilities, maintaining and, where necessary, enforcing a cease-fire
- Demilitarize the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA) and other armed Kosovo Albanian groups
- Establish a secure environment for return of refugees, establishment of transitional administration, and delivery of humanitarian aid
- Ensure public safety and order until international civil presence can take over
- Supervise de-mining until international civil presence can take over
- Support, as appropriate, and coordinate closely with international civil presence
- Conduct border monitoring
- Force protection and protection for international civil presence and NGOs

**U.S. Strategy**
- Assign Europeans to all senior posts, including NATO and UN commands, and UN Mission in Kosovo’s pillars (civil, rule of law, economics, security)
- Maintain/implement national caveats to retain command of U.S. forces under NATO
- Focus on strong force posture and force protection

**Key U.S. Missions**
- Secure future site of Camp Bondsteel
- Ensure timely withdrawal of Yugoslav forces
- Force protection
- Stem flow of Kosovar Albanian weapons and guerillas in southern Serbia
- Support Kosovo Force missions and tasks
- Humanitarian relief in support of UNHCR

**Assessment of Ends-ways-means Relationship**
- Successfully oversaw the withdrawal of Federal Republic of Yugoslavia forces and contributed to KFOR efforts to demilitarize the Kosovo Liberation Army
- Limited capacity to thwart insurgency activities in the Presevo valley, especially due to force protection emphasis
- Use of national caveats helped prevent friendly casualties and retained domestic support but likely detracted from overall security in Kosovo
- Stemmed immediate humanitarian/refugee crisis but conditions remain poor

**Force Structure**
- Approximately 7,000 U.S. troops
  - 26th Marine Expeditionary Unit
  - Task Force Hawk
- USAID Mission (currently 90 personnel)
- Just prior to stability operation, U.S. naval and air operations
  - JTF Flexible Anvil (6th Fleet Operations)
  - Limited strike options
  - JTF Sky Anvil (16th Air Force)
  - Contingency, more extensive strike option
comparable State Department or USAID presence.

Conclusion

Planners charged with identifying U.S. government capabilities for stability operations have much to gain in reviewing the nation’s past experiences in this realm. Although more exhaustive research is warranted, the case studies analyzed by CSIS provide some initial insights that planners should heed. Characteristic across the environmental and operational factors encountered was a level of strategic and operational complexity and uncertainty. The constellation of attributes described above can come together in many often unexpected ways. Moreover, they can also continue changing throughout the course of an operation. This reality requires a planning approach that maximizes flexibility and freedom of action under conditions of extreme uncertainty. In essence, it dictates a capabilities-based planning approach. The next chapter delineates the attendant framework developed and tested by CSIS for use in identifying stability operations capabilities required by the U.S. government.
Developing U.S. Capabilities for Stability Operations

Guided by the historical insights presented in chapter 2, as well as by inputs from stability operations experts inside and outside the Department of Defense, CSIS developed a proposed typology for stability operations. The purpose of this typology is to provide a comprehensive framework of SSTR missions and tasks, for which capability needs could be identified. Crisis or contingency planning immediately before and during an operation must take account of the various environmental and operational attributes at play in a particular case. In a world characterized by operational uncertainty, long-term capabilities development and deliberate planning cannot likewise rely on solutions targeted to particular scenarios. Rather, they require an analytic framework—a typology—that bounds the scope, intensity, and duration of likely operational needs.

Once the typology was established, the research team developed performance indicators, or metrics, for determining mission success within and across the typology. These metrics were then translated into needed capabilities, in some cases further defined into force elements in accordance with the study sponsor’s initial guidance. With these building blocks in place, the research team developed three future scenarios that varied in their mission focus, level of U.S. involvement, and environmental and operational attributes. For each scenario, CSIS drew from its capability building blocks to create integrated, whole-of-government response packages. The team then selected one scenario and its associated capability package and tested its utility during a day-long workshop with stability operations experts. This chapter walks the reader through the capabilities-based planning approach tested in the CSIS process.

Proposed Typology

As the discussion in chapter 1 highlighted, there is no single, doctrinal understanding of the missions and tasks that fall under the stability operations rubric. Department of the Army doctrine for stability operations exists, but it is outdated and currently under revision. Interagency doctrine for stability operations, or any other type of overseas mission, does not yet exist.
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2 The National Response Plan arguably serves as interagency and intergovernmental doctrine for incident management within the United States.
consultations with experts, CSIS chose to begin its stability operations typology with the major mission elements in the Joint Operational Concept (JOC) for Military Contributions to Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations. The JOC’s mission elements track closely with the insights gleaned from the case study analysis. They are as follows:

- Establish and maintain a safe and secure environment;
- Deliver humanitarian assistance;
- Reconstruct critical infrastructure and restore services;
- Support economic development;
- Establish governance and the rule of law; and
- Conduct strategic communication.

These mission elements help to bound the range of capability needs for stability operations. To gauge the intensity and duration of needed capabilities, CSIS created the following categories to describe the type and level of U.S. government involvement:

- Shaping and preparing activities, also known as cooperative engagement;
- Efforts to build partner capacity across the spectrum of governance;
- Direct involvement of U.S. government agencies or forces; and
- Efforts to enable transition to a steady state of cooperative engagement or capacity building.

Some may interpret these categories as an evolution of phased involvement. In reality, many operations will not fit such a linear model. U.S. involvement may skip categories altogether, enter at the direct involvement level and work backward, and/or comprise various government activities operating at different levels of intensity. Taken together, these scope, intensity, and duration considerations produced the stability operations typology displayed in figure 3.

Linking Measures of Success to Capabilities

With its typology in place, the research team next sought to identify qualitative and quantitative measures of mission success across it. These measures would be the gauge by which CSIS evaluated needs and identified capabilities. For each major mission element (MME) and each level of intensity, CSIS determined approximately three to five desired outcomes against which performance could be tracked and measured. CSIS then developed DOD and broader U.S. government capability metrics suited to that mission element at a particular commitment level. The metrics were composed of the following components:

- **Conditions**: The strategic, operation, and/or tactical circumstances in which the metric was applied.
- **Criteria**: The mission goalpost against which performance was measured, along with associated rationale.
- **Standards**: How much of a given capability was needed.
The research team made several important observations in testing this methodology. First, there were substantial interactive effects between different mission elements for which CSIS’s simplified approach did not account. In nonpermissive environments, for example, the U.S. government must be able to establish a sufficiently safe environment (MME 1) prior to restoring the host nation’s ability to provide essential services (MME 3). Second, there were interactive effects between DOD and partner levels of performance. What one actor might be asked to provide in an operation was obviously dependent on the capabilities of another. As a consequence of uncertainty about who might provide what capabilities, the study assumed that current plans for respective military and civilian capabilities in SSTR operations would come to fruition. Thus, a Civilian Response Corps would exist to staff Provisional Reconstruction Teams, and U.S. military advisory capability and capacity would continue to grow. Finally, to be useful to capability planners, metrics must be expressed both in terms of type and capacity. Yet, as is often the case in developing metrics, it was difficult for the research team to quantify these. This problem was significantly alleviated in later stages of the methodology through the use of scenarios, which provided the needed parameters to account for capacity.

Having populated the typology with performance measures and associated metrics, CSIS turned to matching capabilities to these metrics. These capabilities are whole-of-government, but in accordance with the study’s charter, are particularly detailed with respect to the DOD contribution to stability operations. Several capability themes emerged through this process of linking ends to means. First, the capabilities required to establish a safe and secure environment (MME 1) at any level of commitment were, with a few exceptions, the key capabilities needed for all mission elements at the same commitment level. Second, the communications mission element (MME 5) was the area most likely to require unique capabilities not otherwise represented in the typology. Third, the military capabilities needed to support SSTR operations required some form of in-country organization not yet in existence. The CSIS team adopted the Military Assistance and Advisory Group (MAAG) concept to fill this void. Finally, the transition phase of most mission elements emphasized the training and advisory roles required of U.S. military forces and their civilian counterparts. In particular, the study points toward the need for capability planners to think of these missions as relatively lengthy in duration. The study’s resulting performance measures, associated metrics, and key capabilities are provided in appendix B.

Integrated Capability Packages and Scenario Testing

By populating the stability operations typology through the capabilities level, CSIS sought to create a useful resource for capability developers and deliberate
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planners seeking to identify critical future needs and their associated logic. The study team then took this capabilities-based methodology one step further by attempting to create credible, tailored capability packages useful for planning and programming. The key methodological question was the following:

*Could a capabilities-based approach, founded on the likely types of adversary, environmental, and operational attributes the United States would encounter in the future—rather than on the forecast of a specific operation—create viable capability packages that added value for mid- to long-range planners?*

To answer this question, the research team first devised three plausible futuristic scenarios that stressed different combinations of mission elements, U.S. commitment, permissiveness, presence, and other critical attributes. It then used the study’s performance measures-to-capabilities data to devise capability packages fitting each of these scenarios. Finally, CSIS invited prominent stability operations experts to a one-day workshop in order to test whether, in their professional judgment, the CBP-derived capability package for Scenario 3 “fit” U.S. operational needs. Appendix C details the three scenarios and their derived capability packages; appendix D lists the participants for the study workshop.

CSIS workshop facilitators presented subject matter experts with an expanded version of Scenario 3 that detailed the collapse of the Nigerian central government in 2012. Participants included approximately 30 representatives from the Department of Defense, Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development, and prominent former officials. They were informed of the president’s desire to ensure a “free and democratic Nigeria” and were asked to perform the following Interagency Policy Coordinating Committee functions:

- Expand on the president’s articulated objectives for Nigeria;
- Describe the ways in which the United States would seek to fulfill the objectives; and
- Review CSIS’s proposed capability package for the scenario and judge its adequacy.

The workshop proved instructive both in highlighting the limits of force planning, capabilities-based or otherwise, and in understanding some of the key policy issues facing the United States in the realm of stability operations. This report will address the former topic next. The latter topic will be discussed in the subsequent chapter.

Force planners by nature and discipline work within an analytic framework that attempts to match ways and means to desired ends. The capabilities-based approach is no exception to this rational method. The stability operations workshop, however, demonstrated the stubborn resistance of political and operational reality to rationalization. Planners who do not adequately account for such reality are bound to be unprepared for the resulting disconnect between their methods and ultimate employment of capabilities. This disconnect manifested during the study team’s stability operations workshop.
Two separate teams of participants, constituting all of the workshop’s experts, stressed from the beginning the inadvisability of the president’s stated objective. Whereas the planner mindset, which guided the CSIS team’s CBP efforts, assumed the ends as a given and worked only to rationalize ways and means to it, the policy mindset, ably represented by the subject matter experts, sought to redefine the ends in ways that were deemed more realistic. As a result, the capability package presented to the two teams was generally dismissed as much too large and invasive and therefore politically and diplomatically problematic. Participants were particularly opposed to the size of its military ground component, comprising three brigade combat team equivalents. A small minority of participants, themselves military planners, did validate the appropriateness of the developed force package for fulfilling the president’s goals.

Although the workshop participants were generally critical of the force package created through the CBP process, the workshop paradoxically reinforced the fundamental tenets of the capabilities-based approach. It did so by reinforcing the need for those charged with identifying and developing future capabilities to be flexible. The uncertainty of the operational environment extends to domestic political demands and resource constraints as well as the other factors identified by this study. Capability planning must thus be informed by the broadest possible range of factors and missions, allocating risk in accordance with astute operational and geopolitical judgment.
Considerations for Future Stability Operations

CSIS had two primary purposes in conducting this study. First, it sought to devise and test a capabilities-based planning approach for developing capability needs. In chapter 3, we contend that our analysis validates the utility of a capabilities-based approach, while acknowledging the limits of the methodology and of future force planning more generally. The study’s second goal was to provide policymakers and capability planners with specific insights into potential issues arising from a U.S. role in stability operations. Chapter 2 described the many attributes suggested by U.S. experience in Afghanistan, East Asian Tsunami relief, the Horn of Africa, Haiti, and Kosovo. This chapter, which builds on the historical case work, presents the key stability operations themes that arose in the experts workshop:

- The likely reluctance of policymakers to commit U.S. forces to a stability operation in an Iraq and post-Iraq era;
- The reliance on military capability in the absence of sufficient civilian capability;
- The need to actively engage allies and potential partners regarding contributions to stability operations; and
- The overriding importance of U.S. credibility and communication strategy in future missions.

Effects of Operation Iraqi Freedom

Participants in the CSIS workshop were overwhelmingly resistant to a large-scale U.S. stability operation in a foreign country. When presented with an ambitious presidential mandate to ensure the long-term viability and democracy of Nigeria in 2012, stability operations experts were more likely to create less ambitious goals than to fit capabilities to the president’s objectives. In workshop discussions, it was clear to the study team that the U.S. experience in Iraq served as a principal frame of reference for this reluctance to commit forces.

It behooves U.S. strategists and capability planners to heed these early warning signs of a possible “Iraq effect” on future capabilities development and the use of U.S. forces. In the aftermath of Somalia, for example, the United States and other Western nations did little to stem genocide in Rwanda. The United States was slow to react to the evidence of mass killing, and when it did act, it limited its activity to humanitarian relief for refugees who had fled to surrounding nations. The effect of the Iraq experience on the American psyche is likely to be many orders of magnitude greater than that of Somalia. In fact, it may prove most
analogous to the effect of the Vietnam War, which led to a decades-long period of stagnation in America’s small-wars capability.

Given the projected security environment, the United States can ill afford such neglect today. Yet, absent careful forethought and vigorous advocacy, the United States may well ignore stability operations capabilities again—this time at significant peril. Stability operations are often long and dirty, with undefined goals and even muddier outcomes. The requisite capabilities, outlined in appendix C, have few powerful political or institutional advocates. The operations create cultural challenges for civilian agencies, which are generally not optimized for long-duration overseas missions in less-than-permissive environments, and they are undervalued by much of the military, which prefers to focus on high-end warfare without small-wars “distractions.”

**Military-Civilian Capabilities Balance**

Without significant changes to current plans, the military will likely play a central role in the conduct of any substantial future stability operation. The capabilities needed for many mission elements, as outlined in appendix C and validated in CSIS’s stability operations workshop, require speed, durability, and manpower. The U.S. government has not yet invested sufficiently in civilian capabilities to obviate the reliance on military forces for these traits. This is true even in areas of civilian strength, such as governance and judiciary reform, where deployable capacity is small and an ability to operate in nonpermissive environments is even rarer. Planned improvements to civilian SSTR capacity, especially the Civilian Response Corps, are important, and organizational corrections, such as the establishment of the Department of State’s Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, are positive steps in rebalancing SSTR responsibilities across the U.S. government. A more fundamental shift in investment strategies would be needed, however, to create a truly civilian-led SSTR capability.

This problem in many ways parallels that in the homeland security mission set. In both cases, there is substantial cause for concern that the civilian agencies mandated to lead response missions cannot hope to match the capacity and deployability of the Department of Defense. Because of this institutional tension, large, complex operations at home and abroad have tended to rely significantly on military forces. Overseas, the picture is particularly complicated by the unique array of authorities granted to combatant commanders to prosecute the war on terror. The Department of Defense also has substantially more resources with which to exercise its authorities. Congress and the executive branch have not sought the same flexibility for civilian agencies, with the result that in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Africa, the Department of Defense has become a major driver for long-term economic, judicial, and societal aspects of U.S. foreign policy.

Planners in the Department of Defense are thus faced with a seemingly impossible dilemma. Either they must remain squarely in the support lane, risking the inability to succeed in complex stability operations if others cannot effectively
lead on key tasks, or they must venture more broadly into the development, counterterrorism, and governance realms, risking significant military overreach, in order to hedge against the potential lack of civilian capacity. With DOD Directive 3000.05, the department appears to hue more closely to the latter path. This is rightly the lesser of two evils for U.S. national security. The nation still requires a viable, whole-of-government strategy for stability operations that better matches responsibilities to military and civilian strengths. Achieving such a long-term goal will require significant attention to civilian capabilities, in particular, by the Congress and the White House.

Role of Allies and International Partners

In conducting its stability operations workshop, CSIS asked participants to make several assumptions regarding the willingness and ability of potential partners to contribute to a U.S.-led operation in Nigeria. First, the scenario assumed that NATO was unable to contribute military forces to the operation. Second, it assumed that Pacific allies and individual NATO member nations had indicated a willingness to consider U.S. requests for assistance. Workshop facilitators therefore were surprised that participants did not request assistance from these allies and partners. When facilitators probed the causes for this seeming lack of initiative, a seasoned participant stated that the United States typically entertains offers for assistance rather than requesting particular types of help.

The reactive practice of awaiting offers of assistance has a critical implication for U.S. capability planning. It forces planners to prepare conservatively, assuming that no other nations or alliances can be counted on to help (or at least that one cannot plan on what they might bring). This parallels the military-civilian dilemma, wherein the military chooses to plan conservatively out of fear that others will not be prepared. In the case of international partners, U.S. planners would benefit from a more detailed probing of likely international capabilities and willingness for various scenarios. For example, using the CSIS typology, the United States might engage with the United Kingdom, Australia, and NATO to determine which missions and capabilities are strengths for each and identify the likely parameters governing each nation’s willingness to contribute to a future operation. Counting on others’ capabilities certainly incurs risk for the United States, should support fail to materialize. Nevertheless, these planning factors should be understood by policymakers who ultimately need to weigh relative costs and risks in planning future capabilities.

In contrast to their approach vis-à-vis key U.S. allies, workshop participants relied heavily on local and regional actors to assist or lead stabilization efforts. The scenario assumed that a new African Standby Force was already engaged and overwhelmed in Nigeria. Many participants focused attention on providing temporary relief for this force and bolstering its long-term capability to manage the crisis. The latter emphasis on capacity building is consistent with the “indirect approach” advocated in the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review.¹ Force planners

should ensure that U.S. forces are able to train and equip regional and local forces long before they may be needed in a crisis. At the same time, planners should not assume that all of these indirect efforts will be sufficient. As in the Nigeria 2012 scenario and in the case studies, regional capabilities can ultimately become overwhelmed, and U.S. forces might well be called on to perform stabilization missions directly and on short notice.

Credibility and Communications

A final theme emerging from the CSIS workshop was the importance of ensuring that a central objective in any stability operation is the improvement of America’s image and credibility in the world. In the Nigeria 2012 scenario, each team of experts, working independently, highlighted this goal during its deliberations. The two teams also pointed to the need to designate a high-level U.S. envoy to broker a diplomatic resolution to the crisis. Participants examined each element of the strategy—from objectives to ways to means—for how it should be communicated and how it was likely to be perceived by regional actors, allies, potential adversaries, the American public, and any others the United States might wish to influence. One participant noted that effective management of “the American brand” would allow the nation to credibly pursue both its stabilization goals and any proximate interests it has in an operation or region. Participants further noted that communication approaches must be highly tailored to particular circumstances. In general, the United States can afford a more public role in humanitarian relief and like operations than in defense and security operations.

The Joint Operating Concept for Military Contributions to SSTR is consistent with the experts’ emphasis on communication by devoting a major mission element to strategic communication. The Joint Operating Concept governs only the development of military capabilities, however, and the communication issue, although permeating every aspect of operations, is more squarely in the domain of civilian leadership. Stability operations planners should ensure that strategic communications and ideation are central elements of any U.S. government capabilities development or contingency response efforts. This includes planning for sufficient communications staffing and support from the field and in Washington, as well as a high-level communicator who can effectively represent U.S. interests and bolster the American image during the operation.

---

2 The scenario involved three warring factions—a coalition of southern Nigerian tribes seeking economic independence, an al Qaeda-affiliated insurgency in northern Nigeria, and the government of the rump Nigerian state—and a broken cease-fire among them.
Conclusion

Stability operations will almost certainly be a major component of the future U.S. national security environment. Yet the precise nature and timing of these operations is unpredictable. Understanding this certainty-uncertainty paradox is critical for future capability planning. Developing capabilities suited to the wide range of potential future missions requires senior U.S. government officials to balance among expected competing needs and resources, continually reassessing relative costs and risks. It also requires producing a holistic capabilities set that is flexible in its application and hedges against the unexpected. In short, it requires a capabilities-based approach.

From its initial research, CSIS concludes that capabilities-based approaches will present the force planner with many challenges. They rely on detailed analysis of performance measures, an ability to define both capability and capacity needs, and the use of representative scenarios. In addition, they combine concepts, frameworks, and scenarios to guide an understanding of the mission area with empirical analysis of past experience, thus drawing on two distinct and sometimes competing skill sets. Future research should examine means for overcoming or mitigating these planning challenges. It should also focus more concretely on ways to define, strengthen, and institutionalize capabilities-based planning proficiencies in DOD and throughout the U.S. government.

Analysis of stability operations must likewise continue to expand and improve. As a priority, the U.S. government should define with a greater degree of granularity the performance measures and associated whole-of-government capabilities required for the full range of stability operations. CSIS also recommends the following additional areas for future stability operations analysis:

- Probing the effects of the Iraq experience on the likely use of U.S. force or forces in the coming decade;
- Developing a U.S. government stability operations capability roadmap, particularly focusing on ways to effectively transition appropriate responsibilities to the civilian sector;
- Creating a database of likely allied and potential partner contributions to major stability operations, based on type of operation or plausible scenarios; and
- Detailing an effective and tailorable communications strategy for U.S. stability operations.

If the past is prologue to the future, the United States will, in the not too distant future, be presented with a potential stability operation of unknown type, intensity, and duration. Advancing the nation’s understanding of capabilities-based approaches and the means for success in SSTR operations before such an event occurs could significantly improve our ability to respond effectively. Such
analysis is well within the capabilities of the U.S. government. The potential costs for failing to undertake it—to U.S. credibility, treasure, and lives—are striking.
Key Terms and Definitions

**Capability:** The ability to execute a mission under specified standards and conditions through combinations of means and ways to perform a set of tasks.

**Capabilities-based planning:** An approach to managing risk, in a resource-constrained and uncertain environment, through a mix of capabilities best suited to the projected range of operational needs.

**Center of gravity:** The source of power that provides freedom of action, physical strength, and will to fight (Joint Publication 3-0).

**Conditions:** The strategic, operation, and/or tactical circumstances in which a metric is applied.

**Criteria:** The mission goalpost against which performance is measured, along with its associated rationale.

**Decisive point:** A point at which operational momentum shifts in favor of success or failure.

**Military support to Stability, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR):** Department of Defense activities that support U.S. government plans for stabilization, security, reconstruction, and transition operations, which lead to sustainable peace while advancing U.S. interests. (DOD Directive 3000.05)

**Permissiveness:** The level of hostility that U.S. personnel encounter during entry or at any other time during an operation.

**Risk:** The sum of an occurrence’s probability multiplied by its likely effect. Risk cannot always be quantified.

**Stability operations:** Military and civilian activities conducted across the spectrum from peace to conflict to establish or maintain order in states and regions. (DOD Directive 3000.05)

**Standards:** How much of a given capability is needed.

**Wild card:** An unanticipated occurrence that critically influences an operation’s outcome.
### Key Measures and Metrics: Establish a Safe Environment

**Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Establish and Maintain Safe & Secure Environment** | USG (inc. DOD)  
- A trained & ready Interagency (IA) Task Force with a coordinated/approved OPPLAN and a cadre of at least 25 indigenous-language speakers  
DOD  
- XXX thousand general purposes forces trained in Sta Op  
XX thousand prepared to initiate operations within 24 hours | USG (inc. DOD)  
- A trained and ready IA Task Force of XXXX, with at least 1 indigenous-language speaker for each 25 attendees, capable of training XXX medium-grade security officers every two months | USG (inc. DOD)  
- In addition to the training force, XXXX security forces advisors (of which a third are indigenous language speakers) to deploy with indigenous units to provide guidance/instruction while engaged in operations.  
DOD  
- A trained and ready IA Task Force of XXXX, with at least 1 indigenous-language speaker for each 25 attendees, capable of training XXX medium-grade military officers every two months  
- Military assistance program capable of equipping XXXX personnel per month for 2 years. | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Robust capability for CONUS-based education and training of mid- and senior-level security (military, police, etc) officials (50 each 6 months)  
DOD  
- Deploy within 7 days of the cessation of hostilities the de-mining task force. Provide XXXX trainers/advisers for indigenous security forces |
| **Sufficient to permit early efforts to put local men back to work** | | | | |
| **Sufficient to restore local governance capable of providing essential services** | | | | |
| **Sufficient to permit large-scale, civilian-led reconstruction efforts** | | | | |
## Key Capabilities: Establish Safe Environment

### Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- **Sufficient to Provide Essential Services (Food, Water, Housing)**
- **Emergency Medical Care to Local Population**
- **Sufficient to Permit Early Efforts To Put Local Men Back to Work**
- **Sufficient to Restore Local Governance Capable Of Providing Essential Services**
- **Sufficient to Permit Large-Scale, Civilian-Led Reconstruction Efforts**
### Key Measures and Metrics: Deliver Humanitarian Assistance

#### Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deliver humanitarian Assistance</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Rapidly provide food, clean water, shelter and emergency medical treatment</td>
<td>- A trained &amp; ready interagency (IA) Task Force with a coordinated/approved OPPLAN and a cadre of at least 10 indigenous-language speakers DOD</td>
<td>- Capability to deploy (within 7 days of the initiation of conflict) a 100-person IATF (with at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) to oversee delivery of humanitarian assistance and begin early economic recovery and reconstruction DOD</td>
<td>- Deploy within 7 days of the initiation of conflict a 100-person interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) for early economic activity and near-term reconstruction DOD</td>
<td>- Sustain for 2 years a 100-person Interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 20 indigenous-language speakers) to support economic development and mid-term reconstruction DOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Prep sufficient for XXX thousand refugees</td>
<td>- Capability to execute delivery of humanitarian relief to planned capacity levels (see previous metric)</td>
<td>- Provide (within seven days of the initiation of conflict) each battalion commander with a 3-person cell (including one indigenous language-speaker) and $500K (in US and indigenous currency) to generate immediate economic activity and reconstruction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Key Measures and Metrics: Reconstruct Critical Infrastructure

### Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Reconstruct Critical Infrastructure** | USG (inc. DOD)  
- A trained & ready interagency (IA) Task Force with a coordinated/approved OPPLAN and a cadre of at least 25 indigenous-language speakers for near-term reconstruction  
- DOD  
  - Approved doctrine/CONOPs for DOD support for near-term reconstruction and economic recovery; a 500-person (with diverse language skills) civilian affairs force trained in these mission; sufficient authorities and funding to allow local military commanders to jump-start the process, etc. | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Capability to deploy (within 7 days of the initiation of conflict) a 100-person IATF (with at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) to oversee delivery of humanitarian assistance and begin early economic recovery and reconstruction efforts.  
- DOD  
  - Capability to deploy (within 7 days of the initiation of conflict) a 25-person IATF (with at least 5 indigenous-language speakers) to oversee delivery of humanitarian assistance and begin early economic recovery and reconstruction efforts. | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Deploy within 7 days of the initiation of conflict a 50-person interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) for early economic activity and near-term reconstruction  
- DOD  
  - Provide (within seven days of the initiation of conflict) each battalion commander with a 3-person cell (including one indigenous-language speaker) and $500K (in US and indigenous currency) to generate immediate economic activity and reconstruction | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Sustain for 2 years a 100-person interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 20 indigenous-language speakers) to support economic development and mid-term reconstruction  
- DOD  
  - International Consortium capable of providing $X billion per year for economic development and reconstruction |
### Key Measures and Metrics: Support Economic Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Support Economic Development</strong></td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (inc. DOD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapidly provide employment opportunities for military-age men</td>
<td>A coordinated/ approved strategic concept and OPPLAN for how the USG can support near-term economic recovery and longer-term economic growth</td>
<td>Capability to deploy (within 7 days of the initiative of conflict) a 100-person IATF (with at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) to oversee delivery of humanitarian assistance and begin early economic recovery and reconstruction efforts</td>
<td>Deploy within 7 days of the initiation of conflict a 100-person Interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) to support economic development and mid-term reconstruction</td>
<td>Sustain for 2 years a 100-person Interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 20 indigenous-language speakers) to support economic development and mid-term reconstruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore local economic activity to pre-crisis level</td>
<td>Approved doctrine/CONOPS for DOD support for near-term reconstruction and economic recovery; a 500-person (with diverse language skills) civil affairs force trained in these mission; sufficient authorities and funding to allow local military commanders to jump-start the process, etc.</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td><strong>DOD</strong></td>
<td><strong>DOD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay foundation for sustained economic growth</td>
<td>DOD</td>
<td><strong>DOD</strong></td>
<td><strong>DOD</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement**
### Key Measures and Metrics: Support Economic Development

*Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Support Economic Development** | USG (inc. DOD)  
- A coordinated/approved strategic concept and OPPLAN for how the USG can support near-term economic recovery and longer-term economic growth
  
- Approved doctrine/CONOPS for DOD support for near-term reconstruction and economic recovery; a 500-person (with diverse language skills) civil affairs force trained in these mission; sufficient authorities and funding to allow local military commanders to jump-start the process, etc. | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Capability to deploy (within 7 days of the initiation of conflict) a 100-person IATF (with at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) to oversee delivery of humanitarian assistance and begin early economic recovery and reconstruction efforts | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Deploy within 7 days of the initiation of conflict a 100-person Interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) for early economic activity and near-term reconstruction | USG (inc. DOD)  
- Sustain for 2 years a 100-person Interagency (IA) Task Force (including at least 20 indigenous-language speakers) to support economic development and mid-term reconstruction  
- International Consortium capable of providing $X billion per year for economic development and reconstruction |
| **Rapidly provide employment opportunities for military-age men** | | | | |
| **Restore local economic activity to pre-crisis level** | | | | |
| **Lay foundation for sustained economic growth** | | | | |

N/A
### Key Measures and Metrics: Establish Governance & Rule of Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Mission Element</strong></td>
<td>USG (incl. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (incl. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (incl. DOD)</td>
<td>USG (incl. DOD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Establish Governance and the rule of law</em></td>
<td><em>A coordinated/approved strategic concept</em></td>
<td><em>A trained &amp; ready Interagency (IA) Task Force</em></td>
<td><em>Produce (within seven days of the cessation of conflict)</em></td>
<td><em>Provide (within 30 days of the cessation of conflict)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rapidly restore local governance activity</em></td>
<td><em>OPPLAN for how the USG can help establish/restore governance</em></td>
<td><em>and a cadre of at least 25 indigenous-language speakers capable of training an indigenous stability force to enforce a cease-fire, oversee the disarmament &amp; demobilization of belligerent forces, etc.</em></td>
<td><em>how to establish governance (e.g., establishing a transitional administration and interim legislature, forming a constitutional commission, vetting process for indigenous officials, designing an anti-corruption campaign, etc.) and the rule of law</em></td>
<td><em>provide guidance and training for the host-nation's demobilization and reintegration of former belligerents</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Enable civilian-led administration to provide essential services and restore critical infrastructure</em></td>
<td><em>DOD</em></td>
<td><em>DOD</em></td>
<td><em>DOD</em></td>
<td><em>DOD</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Develop transparent and inclusive reconciliation process</em></td>
<td><em>A coordinated/approved strategic concept/OPPLAN for how DOD can help build a civilian Ministry of Defense, establish civilian control of the military and formulate plans for building a traditional military</em></td>
<td><em>Provide (within 7 days of the cessation of conflict) a 25-person JTF (with at least 10 indigenous language speakers) to provide guidance and training for the host-nation's demobilization and reintegration of former belligerents</em></td>
<td><em>Produce (within seven days of the initiation of conflict) a strategic concept/OPPLAN for how DOD can support the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former belligerents into society</em></td>
<td><em>Provide (within 30 days of the cessation of conflict)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Restore a reformed, non-corrupt internal security and judicial system</em></td>
<td><em>Build a &quot;new democratic order&quot;</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Mission Element</td>
<td>Shaping/Prepare</td>
<td>Building Capacity</td>
<td>Direct Involvement</td>
<td>Aiding Transition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Establish Governance and the Rule of Law** | COM  
- Deploy DOS Team to Plan Ceasefire in HN  
- Initiate Talks With UN on Ceasefire Verification  
- No Change  
- Form and Alert Joint Task Force Justice Ministry | COM  
- Receive and Employ IATF to Build National Police Force, Judiciary  
- MAAG  
- MP Brigades for Partnership Patrols With HN Police  
- DOD  
- Alert Reserve Component MP Brigades and Battalions as Needed | COM  
- No Change  
- MAAG  
- Receive Reserve Component MP Units as Needed  
- DOD  
- Deploy Reserve Component MP Units as Needed |
### Key Measures and Metrics: Understand & Engage Key Audiences

**Level/Type of U.S. Government (USG) Involvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Mission Element</th>
<th>Shaping/Prepare</th>
<th>Building Capacity</th>
<th>Direct Involvement</th>
<th>Aiding Transition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Understand and engage key local and foreign audiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide coordinated and synthesized outreach effort from USG and MN partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Support emerging host-nation state to generate public support for nation-building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USG (inc. DOD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A trained &amp; ready Interagency (IA) Task Force with a coordinated/ approved strategic communication plan (including U.S. intent and capability) and a cadre of at least 10 indigenous-language speakers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• As crisis mounts and/or situation deteriorates, maintain 24/7 forward presence to communicate resolve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USG (inc. DOD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a coordinated/approved strategic concept/concept/CONOPs for a tailored strategic communication message and identify the key media outlets for that message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A trained/ready 25-person force (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) that can be deployed with 5 days of the initiation of conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USG (inc. DOD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop a coordinated/approved strategic concept/concept/CONOPs for a tailored strategic communication message and identify the key media outlets for that message</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A trained/ready 25-person force (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) that can be deployed with 5 days of the initiation of conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USG (inc. DOD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sustain for 24 months after the cessation the conflict a 15-person IATF (including at least 5-7 indigenous-language speakers) as the central element for strategic communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Provide a 10-person IATF (including at least 10 indigenous-language speakers) to execute campaign to build an indigenous fourth estate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stability Operations Scenarios and Associated Capability Packages

Scenario 1: Massive cross-border humanitarian crisis with ample coalition partners. Short-term (weeks to months), high-intensity operation.

U.S. Objectives
- Prevent genocide;
- Safely return refugees to home;
- Ease human suffering;
- Provide lift and other unique assistance to regional actors; and
- Assist in rebuilding civil society.

Assumptions
- No forced entry—Host nation (HN) will secure ports and airfields as required;
- No war—U.S. government does not want war at this time;
- Political agreement on aims has been reached between the United States and HN; and
- Thrust is to support HN government and army, not U.S.-led operations.

U.S. Mission
Augmentation of existing country team with capabilities to conduct disaster surveys, preliminary engineering studies, and estimates of line of communication/airfield surveys. Enhancements of embassy capability to integrate civil, military, and nongovernmental organization operations. Increased communications capability of U.S. mission for autonomous classified and unclassified wideband communications and for links to NH communications network.

Regional Combatant Commander
Joint command and control capabilities to support U.S. mission, secure operating bases, establish lines of communication, conduct humanitarian logistic operations, and support U.S. Chief of Mission (COM) and HN in rebuilding civil society. Forces include sufficient U.S. combat and combat support power to secure log base(s), liaise with HN forces, and conduct joint patrols; and engineering capabilities to conduct route reconnaissance, rebuild critical route infrastructure, and supplement HN operation of international airfield and outlying fields as needed. Sufficient download, movement, and warehousing capability to receive,
inventory, and store humanitarian relief supplies. Medical capability sufficient for U.S. forces in theater.

*Department of Defense*

Air and sea transportation to move initial forces to theater and sustain them there, to include humanitarian relief supplies and transport of other allied forces as required to theater. Global communications and intelligence download capabilities as appropriate. On-call combat and combat support forces.

**Scenario 2: Stabilize medium-size weak state, with likely terrorist cells present. Minimal allied assistance. Long-term (five years), sustained, but relatively modest operation.**

*U.S. Objectives*

- Provide governance assistance in the areas of judiciary, elections, law enforcement, and civic life;
- Train and equip existing military forces to prevent terrorist safe havens, ensure territorial integrity/port security, and promote confidence in central government; and
- Counter ideological support for terrorism and promote popular goodwill toward the United States.

*Assumptions*

- No forced entry—Host nation (HN) will secure ports and airfields as required;
- No war—U.S. government does not want war at this time;
- Political agreement on aims has been reached between the United States and HN; and
- Thrust is to support HN government and army, not U.S.-led operations.

*U.S. Mission*

Same as for Force Package 1 with addition of interagency advisers in areas of judicial and electoral systems.

*Joint U.S. Military Advisory Group (in support of COM)*

Command, administrative, and logistic capability to administer 4,000-person advisory detachment with attached logistics and combat support forces. Support operation of HN combat training center, military police school(s), and other training centers with advice and logistic support. Deploy and support advisers and logistic support for selected HN security and combat forces, to include maritime forces, border guards, and investigative forces. Intelligence downlinks to U.S. mission and selected advisory detachments. Maintenance and operations capability for U.S. aircraft, vehicles, and equipment. On-site clinical and medical evacuation capability sufficient for forces in theater.

*Department of Defense/U.S. Government*

U.S. Information Agency to plan, program, release, and maintain U.S./HN multimedia global information campaign. Joint adviser support infrastructure that
includes adviser training and school system. Maintenance of personnel, logistic, and other support systems for forward-deployed MAAG.

**Scenario 3: Stabilize large, collapsed key state with active al Qaeda–affiliated network and underlying ethnic tensions. Some NATO and regional assistance. Medium-term (three to five years) operation with consistent spikes of operational intensity. (Became Nigeria 2012 scenario.)**

**U.S. Objectives**

- Protect key strategic resources;
- Separate warring parties;
- Prevent genocide;
- Assist in creation of stable government;
- Provide governance assistance in the areas of judiciary, elections, law enforcement, and civic life;
- Train and equip existing military forces to prevent terrorist safe havens, ensure territorial integrity/port security, and promote confidence in central government;
- Counter ideological support for terrorism and promote popular goodwill toward the United States; and
- Stabilize capital city and control countryside until transition possible.

**Assumptions**

- No forced entry;
- U.S. government accepts combat operations; and
- No meaningful HN assistance in early stages.

**U.S. Embassy**

- Augmentation of country team to integrate civil, military, and nongovernmental organization operations and increase capacity to operate in hostile environment;
- Enhancements to coalition building and maintenance capacity, including to process offers of assistance in funding, aid, and forces;
- Increased security for embassy and consulates (the latter to grow over time)—Marine Security Guards, State Diplomatic Security, and private security firms;
- Enhanced communications capability of U.S. mission for autonomous classified and unclassified wideband communications to Washington, AFRICOM, and other U.S. government nodes and for links to HN and partner communications networks;
- Support as required to HN government in judiciary, elections, and law enforcement; and
- Contract for 200 local translators to accompany small teams and international/congressional delegations throughout country.
Africa Command

- Joint command and control capabilities via Standing Joint Task Force (SJTF)–Stability Operations Headquarters, to include special ops task force, to coordinate reconstruction and reconstitution of HN armed forces, U.S. combat operations, C2 arrangements with African Standby Force and other partners, and logistic functions;
- Enhancements to coalition building and maintenance capacity, including to process offers of assistance in funding, aid, and forces;
- Two Army/Marine Corps brigade combat team-equivalents with associated combat support and logistics forces, to include medical support sufficient for area combat operations and assistance with disaster relief;
- Three civil affairs/psyop battalions to support U.S. and U.S./HN forces (2 active/1 reserve), 20 to 25 linguists, primarily from Reserve Component;
- Operations at five bases and airfields (at two) in country with associated security forces;
- Includes two wings of close-support and transportation aircraft in country;
- One Carrier Strike Group and associated Expeditionary Strike Group off coast to secure borders and prevent infiltration/terrorist acts by sea;
- Africa Foreign Area Officers (FAOs) identified and readied according to tiered and phased deployment plan for the area of responsibility (AOR);
- Additional specialized SSTR capabilities, especially civil affairs and psyop, resident in U.S. Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; and
- Operational intelligence cell.

Department of State

- U.S. Information Agency to plan, program, release, and maintain U.S./HN multimedia global information campaign; and
- Enhancements to coalition building and maintenance capacity, including to process offers of assistance in funding, aid, and forces.

Department of Defense

- Maintain operational, training, and recruitment base in continental United States and joint adviser support infrastructure that includes adviser training and school system; and
- Maintenance of personnel, logistic, and other support systems for forward-deployed forces.

Department of Homeland Security

- U.S. Coast Guard Deployable Operations Group in Gulf of Guinea; and
- Increased manning for operations center, transportation nodes, critical infrastructure to track potential threats linked to U.S. involvement.

Intelligence Community

- Establishment of a Joint Intelligence Task Force for Nigeria (JITF-Nigeria) based at Bolling AFB to coordinate intelligence support; and
- Additional translation and analysis capabilities focused on West Africa, worldwide al Qaeda and affiliated networks, potential partner nations, and ethnic groups within Nigeria.
Interagency

- Standing Nigeria Policy Coordinating Committee (PCC) including regional and functional experts from throughout interagency;
- Five additional interagency representatives to assist National Security Council (NSC) senior director in coordinating interagency activities and assist in filling emerging operational needs; and
- Office of Management and Budget creation of a supplemental funding and authorization package and orchestration, with NSC, of agency requests.
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<td>U.S. Army (ret.)</td>
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<td>USAID</td>
</tr>
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<td>Lt-Col Dennis Malone</td>
<td>Australian Army / U.S. Department of State</td>
</tr>
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<td>Office of the Secretary of Defense</td>
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<tr>
<td>MG Bill Nash (USA ret.)</td>
<td>Council on Foreign Relations</td>
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<td>U.S. Coast Guard</td>
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<td>Center for a New American Security</td>
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