

Introduction to Cornwallis XII: Analysis for Multi-Agency Support

Professor Alexander E. R. Woodcock, Ph.D.

Chair, The Cornwallis Group
Senior Research Professor and Director
The Societal Dynamics Research Center
School of Public Policy
George Mason University
Fairfax and Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A.
e-mail:aerw@gmu.edu.

Alexander E. R. (Ted) Woodcock is Director of the Societal Dynamics Research Center and a Senior Research Professor in the School of Public Policy at George Mason University. Previously he was Chief Scientist and Vice President at BAE SYSTEMS-Portal Solutions (formerly Synectics Corporation), Fairfax, Virginia. He is a Foreign Member of the Royal Swedish Academy of Military Sciences. Woodcock is also a Guest Professor at the National Defence College, Stockholm, Sweden, and was a Visiting Professor at the Royal Military College of Science, Shrivenham, England for 10 years. He is actively involved in the development and implementation of societal dynamics models of military, political, economic, and other processes for the modeling and analysis of low intensity conflict, peace and humanitarian operations, and related areas. Woodcock is Project Director for the Strategic Management System (STRATMAS) project that is producing a facility that uses genetic algorithms and intelligent automata methods for the definition and optimal deployment of civilian and military entities in peace and humanitarian operations. He is Chair, Proceedings Editor, and a Founding Member of the Cornwallis Group. Woodcock was a Fulbright Fellow and Research Associate in Biology at Yale University. He was an IBM (UK) Research Fellow in the Mathematics Institute at the University of Warwick in England and an IBM (World Trade) Research Fellow at IBM Research, Yorktown Heights, New York. He was a Visiting Scholar in biology on sabbatical leave at Stanford University. Woodcock has a Ph.D. in Biology and an M.Sc. in Biophysics from the University of East Anglia in England, as well as a B.Sc. (with honours) in Physics from Exeter University in England. He is a Full Member of Sigma Xi.

THE CORNWALLIS XII CALL FOR PAPERS

The Call for Papers for Cornwallis XII invited the submission of papers on the general topic of *Analysis for Multi-Agency Support*. The Call pointed out that Interagency, multi-agency, whole of government, 3D (Defence, Diplomacy, and Development) are all a representation of the need for integrated and joined-up planning and operations for peace and stability. The theme for Cornwallis XII is a natural progression from the previous themes of the workshops. The first workshop, in 1995, looked at *Analytic Approaches to the Study of Future Conflict*. Subsequent Cornwallis workshops have stressed the increasing complexity of the conflict environment. Continuing events in Darfur Sudan, Iraq, Afghanistan, Burma,

Timor, Indonesia, Haiti, and elsewhere have shown the critical need to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the methods for intervention.

The Call for Papers observes that when “you stand on the street corner in front of the office of the High Representative in Sarajevo, or in front of the Republican Palace in the International Zone of Baghdad you will see a wide variety of individuals passing by. You will see uniforms of many militaries, and police forces, diplomats, humanitarians, relief workers, and private sector representatives of many differing occupations. You will also see the people of the country within which you are working. All these people share more than a geographic commonality, they also have a purpose.” The Cornwallis XII workshop was formed in order to demonstrate analyses and activities that will help to achieve that purpose. Special attention to models and simulations that can support these analyses was welcomed.

INTRODUCTION

In a Foreword to this volume, Colonel Christopher Holshek, U.S.A., the Executive Director, The Cornwallis Group, observes that “[g]reater integration of all elements of national power is now indispensable to national and international security, as the growing appreciation of multi-agency approaches to these problems reflect.” He also points out that the “need to identify a unifying concept to promote a more holistic, balanced approach, with greater attention to multi-agency processes, the Group agreed, was more a matter of policy than operations – and the linkages between the two.” As Colonel Holshek points out, “This will be the task of *Cornwallis XIII – Analysis in Support of Policy*.”

SESSION I: SESSION CHAIR – PROFESSOR ALEXANDER WOODCOCK, Ph.D.

The First Session of the Meeting was chaired by Alexander Woodcock, Ph.D. The Session involved introductory and welcoming remarks by Woodcock, Chair of the Cornwallis Group, Professor Davis Davis, Founding Chair of the Cornwallis Group, and Suzanne Monaghan, President, The Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. The Civilian Keynote speech was presented during the First Session by Leonard Hawley.

In 2007 The Cornwallis Group elected Alex Morrison, The Founding President of the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, and Geoff Hawkins, a retired Senior Analyst formerly from the United Kingdom Ministry of Defence, as Fellows of the Cornwallis Group. Morrison provided a paper titled: *The Evolution and Future of Peacekeeping* and Hawkins provided a paper titled: *Why so little PSO Analysis in the UK?* that are included in this volume.

The Civilian Keynote Presentation *Policy and Strategies for International Intervention* was presented by Leonard R. Hawley, Former Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of State, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Hawley addressed the question: “How can we do better with interventions in war-torn societies? Failing states such as Afghanistan, Iraq, Haiti, or Sudan have become the defining challenge of our era. International peace and security have been repeatedly disrupted since the end of the Cold War by the disintegration of troubled states. Securing our future depends on building responsible governance and peaceful societies within these states to contain regional disorder, international insecurity,

transnational terrorism, and humanitarian calamity.” Achieving better results, Hawley concludes, requires at least “An ‘empowering UNSC mandate’ backed by key Member States; influential mission leaders to give focused political direction to maintain the ‘primacy of the peace process’ as obstructionists seek to derail progress; and early implementation of all ‘four interlocking strategies’ – political, security, rule-of-law, and political-economic – to jumpstart ‘conflict transformation’ at the outset” as well as a lot of hard work.

SESSION II: SESSION CHAIR — PAUL CHOUINARD, Ph.D.

The Second Session was chaired by Paul Chouinard, Ph.D. The Session consisted of papers presented by Daniel R. Langberg, Richard Taylor, Ronald Cole, and Stephen Gauthier and Matthew Weisner. Eugene Visco, the First Fellow of the Cornwallis Group, led an interesting discussion in the evening after dinner on the first day of the meeting on the topic: *Fourth Generation Warfare: Reality or Myth?* The discussion, which involved most of the Cornwallis XII participants, provided an opportunity to examine the reality of the concept of Fourth-Generation warfare and other changes in military tactics and strategy.

The first paper in the Second Session was presented by Daniel Langberg from The Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) presented a paper titled: *Snapshot of Emerging U.S. Government Civilian Capabilities to Support Foreign Reconstruction and Stabilization Contingencies: Working Draft of the Executive Summary from IDA Document D-3269* as the representative of the team: A. Martin Lidy, Project Leader, David J. Baratto, Daniel R. Langberg, and William J. Shelby all from IDA. The paper discussed “a number of recent directives and transformation initiatives are intended to improve the U.S. Government (USG) capabilities to carry out the President’s transformational diplomacy and reconstruction and stabilization policies outlined in the current National Security Strategy. Because there are 15 Executive Departments and over 100 agencies, boards, and commissions with more than 4.8 million military and civilian employees, the response to these directives as well as any subsequent process and organizational changes will require close collaboration and coordination among the affected organizations, and considerable time to implement.” Research undertaken by the team “The compiled information serves as the baseline for the JFCOM experimentation program to be conducted over the next two years and supports implementation of Department of Defense Directive 3000.05.”

Richard L. Taylor from HQ, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Washington D.C., U.S.A. presented a paper titled: *Humanitarian Assistance and Network Governance: The ORHA Case*. The paper described how “The use of network governance as an approach to providing domestic disaster response and international humanitarian assistance (HA) products and services is not a new concept or approach.” As Taylor points out: “This paper continues the dialogue on HA network governance, contributes to the works discussing military governance in HA and asks: how extensive was network governance used as a tool to prepare for and conduct humanitarian assistance (HA) operations in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) by the Office of Reconstruction and Humanitarian Assistance (ORHA)?” Taylor points out that “The first section [of the paper] introduces ORHA’s strategic setting. The second section discusses the concept of network governance and the application of the Krebs and Holley framework. The gap analysis in section three examines the barriers and enablers associated with a robust ORHA network governance tool.”

Ronald (Skip) Cole, Senior Program Officer at the United States Institute of Peace, in Washington, D.C., U.S.A. presented a paper on *The Need to Play Together: The Case for an Open-Source Simulation for Interagency Coordination*. Cole points out that “There exist widely acknowledged problems with interagency coordination. We do not know where these coordination efforts will lead. Frequently discussed is a ‘Goldwater Niccols’ like act for the various civilian agencies that have to work together in complex operations. Whatever solution is decided upon, it will involved improved training, and will probably involve the creation of cross-functional multi-agency teams.” He continues by observing that “Simulation is the next frontier in training. Many things that were learned via rote memorization, lectures, videos, and even via on the job training and experience are now being learned via simulations. It is only natural that the training that will be required for interagency coordination will involve simulations.” Cole concludes by stating that “Hopefully this paper has made that case that it is highly desirable to have open source simulation software that helps the US Government agencies plan for coordinated action during complex operations.”

Major Gauthier and Cadet Weisner from The United States Military Academy presented a paper titled: *Initial Report on Implementation of a Quantitative Assessment of President George W. Bush’s National Security Strategy* for the following team: Lieutenant Colonel Michael J. Kwinn, Jr., Ph.D., U.S.A., Major Stephen E. Gauthier, U.S.A., and Cadet Matthew Weisner, U.S.M.A., all from the United States Military Academy, Department of Systems Engineering, West Point, New York, U.S.A. The presentation describes how “The Bush Administration released the United States National Security Strategy in 2006. This is an update from the last National Security Strategy which was released in 2002. In this document, the administration lays out its objectives for the United States’ National Security and their plan to achieve these objectives. It does not however contain the means to assess progress towards achieving these objectives. In this paper, we discuss Value Focused Thinking (VFT) and summarize the approach. We then develop our proposed hierarchy and explain the rationale for our structure and especially the metrics we use for our measurements. Finally, we discuss the remaining steps required to apply the assessment system to the National Security Strategy and conclude with future directions for our proposal and approach.”

SESSION III: SESSION CHAIR — GEORGE ROSE, Ph.D.

The Third Session was chaired by George Rose, Ph.D., Co-Chair of the Cornwallis Group. The Session included the Military Keynote presentation by Major General Chris Brown, C.B.E. The Session also included presentations by Anton Minkov and Gregory Smolyneec; and Eugenia Kalantzis, P. Dobias, and D. Connell. Included in this section is a paper by Ann Livingstone that was not presented at Cornwallis XII, but made available for publication in this volume at the request of the Senior Editor.

Major General Chris Brown, CBE, General Officer Commanding Northern Ireland, provided the Keynote Presentation titled: *Co-ordinating International Actors in Post-Conflict State-Building: The Case of Afghanistan 2001-2007*. General Brown discusses the nature of coordination between entities and states that “In terms of methodology, the key co-ordination issues are how the actors routinely harmonize their activities before a crisis; this will not only educate the actors in working together: it will also establish relationships which will serve

co-ordination well in the event of a crisis. Secondly what are the options for the legal and political framework within which the international community intervenes? This will determine the relationship between the actors and may dictate how co-ordination is to be achieved. And thirdly, the way in which the planning for intervention is conducted determines the overall strategy of the international community, or at least those elements which engage in the planning, in the failed state.

[General Brown's] ... hypothesis is that the greater the routine co-ordination between actors, the more robust the framework of the intervention, particularly in terms of a single defined co-ordinating authority and the more inclusive the planning, and the more the international community is prepared to take a long-term view which takes account of the evolution of the target state, the greater chance there will be of rapid progress in re-building the state and transition to full indigenous control and safe international disengagement." He goes on to state that "In order to test this hypothesis, ... [the paper will] look first at the generic difficulties of co-ordination in such circumstances, then ... the specifics of Afghanistan starting with the planning for international intervention in 2001. ... looking at how that planning has been executed over the last 5 years, identifying where co-ordination has succeeded and where it has failed. ... [and] attempt to draw lessons from Afghanistan which may be useful in similar circumstances in the future."

Anton Minkov, Ph.D. and Gregory Smolynech, Ph.D., from the Centre for Operational Research and Analysis, Ottawa, Canada, presented a paper titled: *3-D Soviet Style: Lessons Learned from the Soviet Experience in Afghanistan*. The paper "examines the evolution of Soviet strategy in Afghanistan from the initial invasion to the withdrawal of Soviet combat forces in 1989. [It] ... analyzes Soviet efforts in building Afghan security forces. It includes information on Soviet counter-insurgency practices in Afghanistan and on the adjustments the Soviets made to their force structure and equipment in response to the exigencies of the operational situations they faced. It examines the Soviet approach to civil affairs in their Afghan operations, and outlines the state-building efforts the Soviets undertook in Afghanistan as well as their social and economic policies. The paper also examines the policy of "National Reconciliation" adopted by the pro-Soviet government of Afghanistan to stabilize the country. Among other lessons from the Soviet experience in Afghanistan that can be applied in the current situation, the paper stresses that engaging and enfranchising local populations and power centres is of critical importance; that the economic stability and independence of Afghanistan is a key element in successful state-building; that successive battlefield victories do not guarantee strategic success and that building Afghan security forces is vital. The movement of insurgents and materiel across the Afghan - Pakistan border is a paramount strategic problem."

Ms. Eugenia Kalantzis, P. Dobias, Ph.D., and Mr. D. Connell, from the Defence Research and Development Canada, Centre for Operational Research and Analysis, National Defence Headquarters, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada presented a paper titled: *Assessment of Effects-Based Operations Based on a Whole of Government Approach*. The paper mentions "... [development of] a performance measurement methodology called the [Canadian Expeditionary Forces Command (CEFCOM)] ... Effects Dashboard. This paper presents the recommendations put forward to strengthen the Effects Dashboard. At the heart of this new framework is a set of effects linked from the operational to the more tactical level, along three lines of operation related to governance, development and security. In total, the assessment process involves the evaluation of 132 effects; a set of indicators illustrating the desired characteristics of each effect and an anchored rating scale are defined to help

decrease variability of ratings across raters and rating periods. Additionally, the incorporation of an impact scale and an automatic assessment process for higher-level effects are also discussed. Finally, a process is presented to integrate and gain synergies from the individual assessments across the different partners; this process starts with the assignment of ownership of effects to key partners and ends with the cooperative assessment of overall performance along all three lines of operation.”

Ann Livingstone, Ph.D., Director of Research, Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada contributed a paper to these proceedings titled: *Interdisciplinarity and the Whole of Government: Theory and Praxis*. The paper observes that “In an attempt to deal with the multidimensional, complex realities of contemporary armed conflict, and post-conflict reconstruction, the international community has begun to consider and in some instances, practice a more integrated approach to decision-making and implementation. Sometimes referred to as 3-D, whole of government, integrated decision making, interagency coordination/coordination, or joined up government, it is an evolution of defense, diplomacy and development as the primary players in supporting more creative and flexible responses to the spectrum of conflict. Whether its roots lie in interdisciplinary theory or its offspring, or simply is the most current attempt at dealing with the changed international environment, it represents the realization that new practices are required for managing the dynamic and fluid international conflict environment. This paper, written from a praxis orientation, seeks to examine the progression of the concept and comment on the future of whole of government.”

SESSION IV: SESSION CHAIR — LARRY WENTZ

The Fourth Session was chaired by Larry Wentz and included presentations by Alexander Woodcock, Paul Chouinard, Walter Clarke, and Alexandra Hall.

Professor Alexander E. R. Woodcock, Ph.D., Chair, The Cornwallis Group, Senior Research Professor and Director, The Societal Dynamics Research Center, School of Public Policy, George Mason University, Fairfax and Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A presented a paper titled: *Iraq's Future: An Abstract of an Assessment of the Potential Impact of The Iraq Study Group (ISG) Recommendations on Future Societal Conditions in Iraq*. The paper is an abstracted version of a report titled: *Iraq' Future: Assessment of the Potential Impact of The Iraq Study Group (ISG) Recommendations on Future Societal Conditions in Iraq* by Woodcock. The present paper observes that “The result of this evaluation not only points to an exit strategy involving a combination of ‘internal’ and ‘external’ approaches. Even more, it suggests a scientific - versus polemical - method to argue the case for greater political engagement and resources, as a matter of policy adjustment, to compliment a strategic window of opportunity being created by military operations in Iraq. This is essential to both justify continued Executive and Congressional support of Operation Iraq Freedom through this presently critical period and the forging of a consensus for a successful exit strategy to enable eventual draw-down of military forces under more favorable national security conditions.”

Paul N. Chouinard, Ph.D., Manager Security Operations Research, Defence R&D Canada Centre for Security Science, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada contributed two papers. The first is titled: *The Need for Interdisciplinary Analysis in Support of the Multi-Agency*; the second is titled: *Principal Component Analysis of the Fund for Peace Failed State Index: An*

Interdisciplinary Case Study. In *The Need for Interdisciplinary Analysis in Support of the Multi-Agency* Chouinard observes that “The ‘multi-agency’ characteristic of international interventions to restore peace and stability to a conflicted region reflects the complexity of the challenge of carrying out this task.” He further states that “The ‘multi-agency’ itself brings additional complexity to the problem that cannot be resolved through traditional management approaches that differentiate a problem into relatively independent components and allocate those components to responsible agencies. The result is a need for collaboration amongst agencies, but these agencies may have limited experience in effective collaboration, different cultures and different understandings of the problems or solutions. Analysis of ‘multi-agency’ collaboration and human networks in general is immature. Given these characteristics of the ‘multi-agency’ problem, effective analysis will require the insight that only a truly interdisciplinary approach can provide. In this regard, the analysis faces some of the same collaborative challenges of the multi-agency.”

Dr. Chouinard in his paper titled: *Principal Component Analysis of the Fund for Peace Failed State Index: An Interdisciplinary Case Study* observes that “Since its inception the Cornwallis Group has provided an interdisciplinary forum for the exchange of ideas on analytical approaches related to peace and stability issues. During the 2005 and 2006 Cornwallis Group meetings the Fund for Peace presented its Failed State Index based on twelve indicators of state failure. This paper presents the results of a study applying the mathematical technique of principal component analysis to both confirm the Fund for Peace’s Failed State Index and to identify additional patterns and trends in the Fund for Peace data. This was done as a proof-of-concept in demonstrating the value of the Cornwallis Group in providing an interdisciplinary forum.”

Walter Clarke presented a paper titled "*Interagency Coordination" and the Search for a Practical Civil-Military Paradigm* for Walter S. Clarke, Senior Advisor for Civil-Military Cooperation, Global Center for Disaster Management and Humanitarian Action, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, U.S.A. and Arthur E. “Gene” Dewey, Subject-Matter Expert on Comprehensive Planning, Former Assistant Secretary of State, For Population, Refugees and Migration. The paper states that “There are a number of reasons why the earnest efforts of good men and women on both sides of the civil-military barricades failed to achieve the exemplary levels of mutual understanding and cooperation called for in the evolving doctrine.” ... The paper also “review[s] many of the current problems in civil-military relations, including problematic sloganry (‘unity of effort’), the yawning resource gaps between civilian and military agencies, the significant cultural differences between organizations, and we will focus on certain individual agency problems.” The paper also observes that “The increasing acceptance of social science tools by military commanders in the field is encouraging. As demonstrated by current military efforts to utilize insights facilitated by social scientists, the US has clearly followed incorrect paths in fighting jihadism on a worldwide basis; its military and public diplomacy tactics in Iraq have been largely counterproductive, and our enemies have so far been able to push the US Government behind barricades.”

Alexandra Hall, SCS Ltd., The Court House, Northfield End, Henley-on-Thames, Oxfordshire, England, U.K. presented a paper titled: *Understanding Decision-Making in International Crisis Management: The Use of Strategic-Level Decision Games*. The paper “considers the nature of decision-making at the strategic level and explores the process by which national actors decide upon particular courses of action. It goes on to describe how bespoke Decision Games can constitute a useful tool through which practitioners may

explore the various instruments of power and be exposed to the deliberations and machinations of national-level decision-making within a learning environment. SCS has a developed capability in this area and a case study is provided which illustrates an entirely new method of decision-gaming that reflects the complex concurrency of decision-making at the strategic level.”

SESSION V: SESSION CHAIR — KARL BERTSCHE

The Fifth Session was chaired by Karl Bertsche and included presentations by Ann Campbell and Joseph Cuadrado, Alexander Woodcock, Stella Croom-Johnson, and Sasha Kishinchand.

Colonel Ann M. Campbell and Joseph F. Cuadrado III, Directorate for Strategic Plans and Policy (J-5), The Joint Staff, The Pentagon, Washington, D.C., U.S.A, presented a paper titled: *Integrating Interagency Efforts – Two Interactive Tools*. “This paper is designed to share information with the participants at Cornwallis XII. The authors, a uniformed member of the US Joint Staff and an ANSER Inc employee on contract to the Joint Staff, have used two interactive tools, described in this paper, to help integrate interagency efforts relating to Iraq and to Afghanistan. The two tools (influence net modeling and effects-based assessment) were used to establish a common framework of shared goals and objectives in the interagency environment.”

Alexander Woodcock, Ph.D. presented a paper titled: *The Strategic Management System (STRATMAS®): The Afghanistan Study 2003 and Exercise Iraq Future 2005* for Professor Alexander E.R. Woodcock, Ph.D., Chair, The Cornwallis Group, Senior Research Professor and Director, The Societal Dynamics Research Center, School of Public Policy, George Mason University, Fairfax and Arlington, Virginia, U.S.A. and S. Anders Christensson, M.Sc., Swedish National Defence College, Stockholm, Sweden.

The paper by Woodcock and Christensson “describes two different exploratory exercises using the Strategic Management System (STRATMAS®). STRATMAS® is part of an ongoing research effort at the Swedish National Defence College in collaboration with George Mason University. The research has involved the visual and formal synthetic representation of failing states, support in the generation of intervention plans, and the interaction of those plans with the synthetically failing state. These plans have been analyzed in order to explore their robustness. During simulation activities the practitioners can follow the development of failing state’s theme-based indicators as a result of generated plan.” Furthermore: “How these systems might support large, distributed, staff operations in different scenario activities has been investigated. The research has used war, peace enforcement, peacekeeping, peace building, humanitarian disasters and relief and non-combatant evacuation operation scenarios to drive software design and usability studies. Experience gained from use of STRATMAS® in two different exploratory exercises can be used to enhance the links between procedural steps within the overall simulation facility. A number of new national-level economic models have also been developed and it is hoped that those models will be implemented in a future version of STRATMAS® in order to provide additional governmental and economic theme-based indicators for use in future explorative studies.”

Stella Croom-Johnson, Policy and Capability Studies, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory, Farnborough, Hampshire, England, UK. Presented a paper titled: *Representation of Multi-Agency Activities within the DIAMOND Simulation Model*. The paper points out that “DIAMOND is a purpose-built simulation model with the specific aim of looking at issues associated with PSO, and provides a dynamic and auditable assessment of those issues for UK and coalition forces. The simulation is fully multi-sided, and can represent the activities of all actors within a PSO. The model is in current use within Dstl and is proving useful in furthering our understanding of PSO-related issues. It is still evolving, partly because the model has not yet reached full maturity, and partly due to the evolving nature of PSO.”

Sasha Kishinchand, International Security Consultant, SK Consulting presented a paper titled: *Tools and Techniques for Enhancing Donor-Host-country Coordination in Complex Conflict Environments*. “The analysis in this paper [relies] ... heavily on the author’s experience in Iraq over the past four years, however it will draw on interventions over the past decade and a half to develop a more comprehensive analysis and inform a more widely applicable approach to coordinating international assistance in complex conflict environments.” The paper observes that “Information exchange is a crucial component of coordination in stabilization and reconstruction. Whether opportunities for diverse actors to interface occur in physical forums or through virtual forums, connectivity increases effectiveness. However tools, processes, and systems should be kept simple so that the ‘Do Something’ sentiment does not produce a ‘Do everything’ reaction and end up as a ‘Do nothing’ reality during implementation of an intervention.”

SESSION VI: SESSION CHAIR — PROFESSOR DAVID DAVIS

The Sixth Session was chaired by David Davis and included papers by Corey Lofdahl, Andrew Hossack, and Nichola Picken. Major General Chris Brown, C.B.E. was the after-dinner speaker during the Company of Good Cheer Dinner on Wednesday evening. General Brown has graciously provided an abstract of his remarks at that dinner for inclusion in this volume.

Corey Lofdahl, Ph.D., BAE Systems, Burlington, Massachusetts, U.S.A. presented a paper titled *Synthesizing Information for Senior-level Decision-Makers using Simulation*. Dr. Lofdahl points out that “Modern computers have made ever-increasing amounts of processing power available to senior-level decision makers, but they have also overwhelmed them with ever-increasing amounts of hard-to-understand data. Modeling and simulation addresses the data overload problem by ‘boiling down’ data and synthesizing information at the macro-level. This capability is developed in three sections. First, the general policy problem is described. Second, policy is discussed in terms of today’s 21st century security context. Third, an example simulation is developed that does three things: it 1) combines military and economic policy factors within a single model, 2) specifies the direct, indirect, and cascading consequences that tend to thwart policies and confound policymakers, and 3) allows policy makers to manipulate policy levers and see their dynamic consequences within seconds using simulation rather than months or years in the real world.”

Andrew Hossack, Ph.D., Policy and Capability Studies Department, Defence Science and Technology Laboratory (Dstl), UK Ministry of Defence (MoD), Farnborough, Hampshire, England, U.K. presented a paper titled: *Security Force and Insurgent Success Factors in*

Counter-Insurgency Campaigns. Dr. Hossack's paper was selected by the Cornwallis XII participants as the Best Paper at the meeting.

The paper by Dr. Hossack observed that "At Cornwallis X in 2005, a paper (Hossack and Sivasankaran, 2006) was presented on work then underway within Dstl to identify generic state and security forces' success factors that are statistically significantly associated with the achievement of campaign success across a range of historical and contemporary counter-terrorist/counter-insurgency (CT/COIN) campaigns. This paper reports the additional progress made and results obtained by this continuing research programme in the two years since then. Specifically, this paper presents the mature results now available from separate static analyses of the generic success factors most likely to improve the odds of achieving campaign success in generic CT/COIN campaigns for *both* the state and its security forces *and*, conversely, for its terrorist/insurgent opponent. A method for quantifying the value of possession of each such success factor in isolation in terms of equivalent force multiplier values is also presented, as are a number of secondary observations and minor results arising from this analysis."

Miss Nichola Picken, an HQ ISAF IX Operational Analyst, presented a paper titled: *Provincial Level Assessment: An analyst's experience of developing a detailed provincial level assessment for Afghanistan*. The paper describes the proposition that "In order to more accurately assess North Atlantic Treaty Organisation's (NATO) mission in Afghanistan as HQ International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) IX, COMISAF directed HQ ISAF Operational Analysis (OA) to develop a provincial level assessment using a pictorial methodology. This process would assess the progress of the mission by province on a monthly basis along Security, Governance, Development and Threat Lines of Operation (LoP). Several issues had to be resolved and investigated before development could begin to avoid repetition and to develop the most appropriate and detailed assessment possible. ... This paper describes the thought processes, collaborations and decisions made by the HQ ISAF IX OA team in order to develop the Provincial level assessment, now called 'ISAF Provincial Assessment (IPA)'."

SESSION VII: SESSION CHAIR — EUGENE VISCO

The Seventh Session was chaired by Eugene Visco and consisted of presentations by Larry Wentz, Michael Baranick, and Tom Nicastro.

Larry Wentz, the Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. presented a paper titled: *Afghanistan Telecom and IT (ICT): Challenges and Opportunities*. The paper observes that the "National Defense University, Center for Technology and National Security Policy studies suggest that information and IT can significantly increase the likelihood of success in failed-state interventions and subsequent reconstruction if they are engaged from the outset as part of an overall strategy and plan that coordinates the actions of outside interveners and focuses on generating effective results for the affected nation. This paper examines Afghanistan telecoms and IT as a case study of its use as an enabler of sector reconstruction. Some of the successes and related coordination and information sharing challenges encountered by the multinational civilian and military responders and with Afghan organizations are illuminated as well."

Michael J. Baranick, Ph.D., from the Center for Technology and National Security Policy, National Defense University, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. and Stephen P. Rodriguez, Senior Associate, Sentia Group, Washington, D.C., U.S.A. presented a paper titled: *Navigating Unstable Peace: A Conflict Resolution Map for Nagorno-Karabakh (N-K)*. The paper observes that “The steady-state conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh (N-K) continues to fester despite numerous attempts by the international community at mediation. Openly disputed between Armenians and Azerbaijanis, this small, mountainous area in the South Caucasus of the former Soviet Union has been the scene of bitter fighting for nearly 20 years. Although a Russian brokered ceasefire generally holds, tit-for-tat violations are common and the political battles between the respective sides are still dramatic. Because of the global scramble for petroleum reserves, interest in the Baku-Tblisi-Ceyhan (BTC) pipeline has elevated the importance of this protracted dispute from an obscure regional conflict to an issue that occupies the docket of international political and business leaders. International organizations and governments alike can do little in Armenia and Azerbaijan without stumbling across the N-K conflict.”

Tom Nicastro, Ph.D., Vice President, The Louis Berger Group, Inc., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. presented a paper titled: *Hearts, Minds, Contracting, and Infrastructure: A Case Study of Corporate America’s Role in Fragile and Conflict/Post-Conflict Areas—The Louis Berger Group in Afghanistan*. The paper “uses as a point of reference the United States Agency for International Development’s (USAID) rapid response and mobilization in the summer of 2002 to reconstruct needed infrastructure in Afghanistan as part of the Bonn Accords, a lynchpin for Afghan unity. This paper ... assess[es] the infrastructure and institutional reconstruction efforts of The Louis Berger Group (LBG) as a front-line USAID partner. The impact of selected infrastructure on Afghan lives ... [was also] reviewed. Berger was selected by USAID in late 2002 as its contractor for over \$730 million of civilian infrastructure. That contract ended in mid-2007.”