

## FYSA: For Your Situational Awareness

ISSUE 14 | DECEMBER 2014

## Select Upcoming Events

HOLDING THE LINE IN THE 21ST  
CENTURY

Featuring Chief Michael Fisher and  
Assistant Chief Robert Schroeder of the  
U.S. Border Patrol.

Tuesday, January 6, 2014

9:30–11:30 a.m.

CSIS, 1616 Rhode Island Ave., NW

## Select Recent Events

SMART WOMEN, SMART POWER  
LAUNCH

Featured a conversation with Ambassador  
Samantha Power, U.S. permanent  
representative to the United Nations.

## PONI 2014 WINTER CONFERENCE

Featured a keynote address by Secretary  
of the Air Force Deborah Lee James, as  
well as panels of presentations by young  
nuclear experts.

THE FUTURE OF HOMELAND  
MISSILE DEFENSE:  
A FRESH LOOK AT PROGRAMS  
AND POLICY

Featured a series of panels on the policy  
and programmatic aspects of the future  
homeland missile defense and a keynote  
by VADM James Syring, director, Missile  
Defense Agency.

THE ARMY AND A COMPLEX  
FUTURE

Featured a discussion with LTG H.R.  
McMaster, director, Army Capabilities  
and Integration Center, on the Army's  
newly released capstone operating  
concept and how the Army plans to  
meet future challenges.

U.S. FLEET CYBER COMMAND:  
ANSWERING THE EVOLVING  
THREAT

Featured a conversation with VADM  
Jan Tighe, commander, U.S. Fleet Cyber  
Command.

## IRAN: AGREE TO KEEP TALKING

SHARON SQUASSONI

@CSIS\_PPP



Iranian and Western negotiators agreed on one thing in late November: to keep talking. The November 2013 Joint Plan of Action envisioned a six-month implementing period for negotiators to arrive at a comprehensive solution on Iran's nuclear program. This has now become 18 months with the latest extension.

Optimists like Vice President Joe Biden interpret the extension as evidence of sufficient progress to merit continuing negotiations. Yet failure would untether Iran from the restrictions it agreed to last November. To pessimists, the extension is a symptom of Iran's continued defiance of the nuclear nonproliferation regime.

The incentives to keep talking are significant on both sides: Iran receives sanctions relief in exchange for practical limits on its nuclear program. In the first six months, Iran obtained about \$6 billion in sanctions relief. The two extensions may provide Iran with access to an additional \$8 billion.

For the West, continued negotiations mean further small steps from Iran in limiting its nuclear program. Beginning in January 2014, Iran has downblended its stocks of 2 percent enriched uranium, converted its 20 percent enriched uranium into fuel, agreed to enhanced monitoring, and halted further modifications of key facilities (enrichment plants and the heavy water research reactor). Iran has limited its installment of new centrifuges to replacing broken ones.

But how long can this go on? Maybe indefinitely. And contrary to conventional wisdom, that might not be a bad thing. Part of the problem with the Joint Plan of Action was the insistence that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed. This formulation speaks volumes about the lack of trust on both sides. In the meantime, the only way to build confidence in intentions is demonstration through actions. Both sides must demonstrate their will and capability to follow through on small steps. Rather than the modalities of negotiations, we should pay attention to implementation of the current agreement to assess whether it builds confidence in the sustainability of a final agreement. Lastly, we should keep an eye on the political windows of opportunity to ensure that they don't close prematurely. ■

## OPEN GOVERNMENT DATA CAN HELP IMPROVE PERFORMANCE AND PROVIDE ACCOUNTABILITY

GREGORY SANDERS

@gregorysanders



The recent release of the [Senate Intelligence Committee report on detention and interrogation](#) has brought renewed focus to the advisability of releasing sensitive government information to the public. To be sure, publishing data on what the government has done and whether or not it worked can be frightening, particularly for those under the microscope. Beyond protecting personal identifying information and critical technical details, even the best-run agencies hold data that domestic opponents or foreign enemies might use against them. However, despite these costs, open societies benefit enormously by learning from mistakes, refining performance, and holding government officials accountable.

The United States [does comparatively well at transparency](#); cross-national research leaves me grateful for all that it publishes. The Defense-Industrial Initiatives Group (DIIG) at CSIS relies on government data to help us understand government performance and industry trends. Over the past year, there have been several information transparency advances we have found particularly beneficial: the ongoing series on the [performance of the Defense Acquisition System](#) and [ForeignAssistance.gov's](#) release of State Department and transaction data. Similarly, many of our past reports were only possible thanks to decades of work expanding public access to data. Turning away from the principle of open government data would undercut this process and impede efforts to find solutions to present and future problems. DIIG is now working on a project breaking new ground in using the Federal Procurement Data System to track contracting outcomes. One new method we are employing is to study contract terminations, because a termination means at the very least the vendor has underperformed or the government failed to anticipate a dramatic shift in its needs.

Our initial research has found that terminations spiked in fiscal year 2011, before the super committee failed and sequestration became law, but coincident with the drawdown in Iraq and the implementation of Secretary Robert Gates's program cancellations. However, the correlation between project cancellation and contract terminations is weaker than expected. The Littoral Combat Ship, a program that was troubled but pulled through, had a higher rate of termination than several cancelled projects, including the Future Combat System. Perhaps most surprisingly, size does not protect contracts from termination. Instead, our longest and largest categories of contracts were terminated about 10 percent of the time, versus less than 3 percent for contracts overall.

If you are interested in hearing more about our ongoing research in this area, [please feel free to send me an e-mail](#). Improving government performance is collaborative, and the practitioners and experts that read our reports can be one of our most valuable resources. ■

## Multimedia



**WATCH** Jamie Morin, director, cost assessment and program evaluation, Department of Defense, discuss defense budgeting in an uncertain fiscal environment, part of the CSIS Military Strategy Forum series.



**WATCH** Andrew Hunter discuss what the “Cromnibus” means for Pentagon spending on Defense News.

## Congressional Testimony

**READ** Andrew Hunter's testimony before the House Committee on Armed Services, “The Role of Maritime and Air Power in the DoD's Third Offset Strategy.”

## A REVISED MARITIME STRATEGY: WORTH THE WAIT?

MARK LAWRENCE  
@CSIS



Admiral Jonathan Greenert, chief of naval operations, confirmed that the U.S. Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard will soon release a new maritime strategy. Observers argue the strategy is long overdue, considering it is meant to update guidance first issued in 2007 and to align naval forces to missions enumerated in the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance.

The document's delay may be a blessing, however, given the starkly different security and fiscal circumstances now facing our maritime forces. The past year witnessed rapid changes in the international environment, from Europe to the Middle East. Perhaps even more important, the sea services have had two years to reflect on their experience under sequestration in 2013 and contemplate the likely return of Budget Control Act-level spending caps in 2016. To the extent that a new strategy reflects these lessons, it will provide more relevant guidance today than it would have even one year ago.

A new maritime strategy's value to the Navy in particular will be measured by whether it articulates—for Defense Department leadership, Congress, the American public, and international partners—how the fleet will preserve its solvency in the face of longer-term structural challenges that have only been exacerbated by the present budget environment. The 2007 strategy proffered a Navy eager to meet increasing demand—prepared to expand its global security activities into such realms as humanitarian assistance and disaster response, while maintaining the capacity to aggregate power in two main regions on short order. The new strategy must reflect genuine resource constraints, while acknowledging the Navy's concerns over readiness and future combat credibility. It should distill plans to balance a fleet of sufficient size for today's needs with major expenditures to preserve our armed forces' asymmetric advantage in power projection.

If it is to succeed, the strategy cannot sit idle as a paean to technology “offsets” or a thinly veiled plea for reallocating service budget shares. Just how the Navy uses the document to inculcate a “cross-domain” warfighting perspective (leveraging cyber and electromagnetic maneuver) into its procurement and operational design, and to mitigate capacity shortfalls through deepened cooperation with key partners, will provide early tests of its eventual consequence.

CSIS's Maritime Security Dialogue, presented in partnership with the U.S. Naval Institute, will provide a venue during 2015 in which to explore such issues associated with the trajectory of the U.S. sea services. ■

## Media Highlights

“He’s got the substance and the moxie. You can be much more persuasive... when you are forceful in what you are saying and everyone knows you know what you’re talking about.”

—Andrew Hunter to the *Wall Street Journal* on Ashton Carter and his nomination to be secretary of defense.

“The strategy has intuitive appeal. America has a cultural affinity for technology and self-identifies as a nation of innovators. But there is ample room for skepticism.”

—Maren Leed in a *Defense News* op-ed on the Department of Defense's so-called third offset strategy and the hurdles it faces.

“You can’t do technology investment one year at a time; you’ve got to have a long-term plan in order to really guide technology investment properly.”

—David Berteau to *Government Executive* on defense acquisition reform.

## FINDING COMMON GROUND: MILLENNIALS AND THE MILITARY

JAIMIE HOSKINS

@CSISecDialogue



With wars ending, the economy improving, and, some believe, a generational shift in how today's young men and women perceive military service, the U.S. armed forces are confronted with a new set of recruiting challenges. Concerns about the generational shift and how millennials fit in the military were exemplified in an [op-ed](#) last summer by Commander Darcy Cunningham, where she questioned the ability of millennials to adapt to the traditional and structured environment of the military. However, the generational differences may not be as big a hurdle as perceived by some. While the [desired work environment of Generation Y](#)—which includes work-life balance, greater career flexibility and working hours, and strong, cohesive team environments—has some marked differences from that of Generation X, their preferences actually fit well with military culture. A clearer message targeting this new generation of future leaders is needed to promote military service to millennials.

Meeting millennials' desires are challenges with which many employers grapple. Some aspects may be easier for the military to meet than corporations and the public sector, even though military service does not perfectly match millennials' workplace wish list. For example, the military can offer millennials a degree of fluidity in their careers that is difficult for other employers to mirror. Servicemembers are likely to change jobs every two to three years and attain a diverse set of experiences in different environments through deployments and transfers, giving them, perhaps paradoxically, flexibility in their career path. It is also difficult to replicate the cohesive, team environment servicemembers enjoy. It would be nearly impossible for companies to reproduce the tight-knit team environment that exists from the moment a recruit enters basic training.

Many millennials may overlook the alignment of military culture with their workplace preferences because of their preconceptions about what it means to be a servicemember. These preconceptions are in part due to growing up during highly publicized wars that focused the public solely on the combat aspect of service life. Expanding the narrow conception of military service through clearer messaging of aspects that appeal to millennials could help attract young people that might otherwise choose the private sector because of a lack of knowledge about military service. If the military is unable to attract quality personnel from this generation, the force may be negatively impacted at a time when the nature of conflict and declining end strength makes maximizing personnel quality an imperative. ■

*FYSA is a monthly electronic publication produced by the International Security Program at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), a private, tax-exempt institution focusing on international public policy issues. Its research is nonpartisan and nonproprietary. CSIS does not take specific policy positions; accordingly, all views, positions, and conclusions expressed in this publication should be understood to be those of the author(s). © 2014 by the Center for Strategic and International Studies. All rights reserved.*

For more content from the International Security Program, please visit [WWW.CSIS.ORG/ISP](http://WWW.CSIS.ORG/ISP). Please contact Mr. T.J. Cipoletti, Associate Director, ISP, at [TCIPOLETTI@CSIS.ORG](mailto:TCIPOLETTI@CSIS.ORG) with any comments, suggestions, or questions about FYSA content or ongoing ISP activities.

## Recent Publications

[READ](#) “A Recommended Agenda for the Next Secretary of Defense,” featuring a series of articles by ISP scholars on recommendations for priority action by the next secretary.

[READ](#) “Federated Defense in Asia” for an analysis of critical capability and capacity gaps in the region and potential federated initiatives to address them.

Follow CSIS

[f/CSIS.ORG](https://www.facebook.com/CSIS) [@CSIS](https://twitter.com/CSIS)