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1. **Overview:**

Sponsored by the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) will host the Military Operations Research Society (MORS) Workshop on January 2018 at MacDill Air Force Base, FL. The meeting purpose is to advance the professional state of Tactical through Strategic assessments, to include education, training, practices, and coordination. The Special Meeting will examine assessments performed at the Strategic, Operational, and Tactical levels in support of Theater Campaigns, Contingencies, and Named Operations.

2. **Participants**

Analysts from the Army, Air Force, Navy, Marines, Intelligence Community, NATO, “5 Eyes” and interagency partners. Anyone with experience or an interest in assessments in support of Contingencies or Named Operations, Operational, or Strategic Assessments. Areas include, but not limited to: Campaign and Contingency Planning, COA Development, COA Comparison, Logistics, Intel/Battlespace Awareness, Red Teaming, Information Visualization, Mission Analysis, Risk Assessment, Decision Support Analysis, or Humanitarian Relief Operations.

3. **Meeting Objectives**

In general, this Special Meeting will utilize a combination of subject matter experts and practitioners of quantitative and qualitative assessments (with emphasis on operations research, intelligence and interagency areas) to: (1) Teach four best practices in assessments and determine if they are worthwhile to continue to teach, (2) extract the techniques and procedures that provide useful insights and applications to the overall community and determine which are best to add to the assessment instruction, (3) incorporate these insights and training materials into an unclassified document for future use by the Assessment Community of Interest.

4. **Background**

We have experienced over 14 years of intense deployed and reach-back support to contingency and other operations. Combatant Commands, their associated Service Components, and Joint Task Forces have gone through a new revival of assessments over the past three years and are set to experience a new phase based on new Joint Staff requirements. The purpose of this workshop is to share and record the knowledge gained from the community’s recent experience to advance the state of the art of assessments at all levels. We will also look at the extensibility of the operations support analytic tools and techniques to project as well as program and perform portfolio management in DoD, an area rife for improvement. Attendees will gain a valuable understanding of the tools, skills and knowledge required; as well as the organizations and programs where that capability could be applied. An informal Community of Interest exists and last met in Tampa in April, and this meeting will capitalize on gains the group has gained so far.

5. **Approach and Agenda**

This mini-symposium consists of Training in the form of four 3 hour Practical Exercise sessions (PEs) to conduct initial training across the assessments community and refine the education curriculum for future assessors. There are ten Working Group Tracks, each possessing guest speakers, presentations or discussions, as determined by the Working Group Lead.

Practical Exercises:
There are two sets of working groups; one for Strategic Assessments and one for Operational Assessments. Each group has 6-12 hours for guest speakers, instruction, or information sharing. It is up to the working group lead to determine the duration of each briefing and subsequent discussion.

Strategic Track Sessions:
1) Assessment Education, Training, and Doctrine
2) National Strategic Assessment (Joint Staff: JMNA, CNAs, Campaign Plans)
3) Strategic Assessment (CCMDs)
4) Programmatic and Country-Level Assessments
5) Assessment Frameworks and staff implementation

Operational Track Sessions
6) Operations Assessment (Deployed Units, Service Components and JTFs)
7) Data Visualization
8) Intel and Predictive Analysis
9) Polling Methods and Tools
10) Data Collection, Metrics, Measures, and Databases

Working Group leads are encouraged to make maximum use of time prior to the conference so as to leverage time available at the conference. The group should prepare a draft document by the end of the conference some work will likely be required to polish the final product after conference completion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day/Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sunday, 21 Jan 2017 - TBD lobby</td>
<td>1600 – 1800 Pre-Registration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Monday, 22 Jan 2017 - Davis Conference Center, MacDill AFB, FL | 0715-0830: Registration  
0830-1130: Round-Robin discussion and PE 1  
0830-0920: Presentation and questions  
0930-1045: Practical Exercise  
1100-1130: Summarize and Conclude  
1300-1530: Round-Robin discussion and PE 2  
1300-1350: Presentation and questions  
1400-1515: Practical Exercise  
1530-1600: Summarize and Conclude |
| Tuesday, 23 Jan 2017 - Davis Conference Center, MacDill AFB, FL | 0730-0830: Registration  
0830-1130: Round-Robin discussion and PE 3  
0830-0920: Presentation and questions  
0930-1045: Practical Exercise  
1100-1130: Summarize and Conclude  
1300-1530: Round-Robin discussion and PE 4 |
1300-1350: Presentation and questions
1400-1515: Practical Exercise
1530-1600: Summarize and Conclude
1630: Informal Event (Beach Cookout)

Wednesday, 24 Jan 2017 - Davis Conference Center, MacDill AFB, FL
0715-0800: Registration
0800-0830: Introduction
0830-0915: Guest Speaker
0930-1015: History of Assessments
1015-1045: Purpose and Endstate of the Meeting
1100-1150: Working Group Sessions 1

1300-1350: Working Group Sessions 2
1400-1450: Working Group Sessions 3
1500-1550: Working Group Sessions 4

Thursday, 25 Jan 2017 - Davis Conference Center, MacDill AFB, FL
0730-0820: Working Group Sessions 5
0830-0920: Working Group Sessions 6
0930-1020: Working Group Sessions 7
1030-1120: Working Group Sessions 8

1230-1320: Working Group Sessions 9
1330-1420: Working Group Sessions 10
1430-1520: Working Group Sessions 11
1530-1630: Working Group Sessions 12

1430-1620: Plenary 1 (one chair or co-chair from WG 1-5)
1430-1620: Plenary 2 (one chair or co-chair from WG 6-10)

1700: Social Event

Friday, 26 Jan 2017 - Davis Conference Center, MacDill AFB, FL
0800-0850: Working Group Wrap-Up
0900-0930: Plenary 1 Presentation
0930-1000: Plenary 2 Presentation
1010-1100: Closing Comments and Wrap-up
1300-1500: ACOI, WG chairs and Staff Wrap-up and Way Ahead

Endstate
Initial broad training complete for the joint assessment community on known best practices. A list of pertinent classes and PEs (with associated POIs) published for follow-on Assessment Community of Interest training. A compiled list of outstanding issues for the Assessments COI to address in future symposia.

Plenary Sessions
There are two Plenary sessions; one for Strategic Assessments (WG 1-5) and one for Operational Assessments (WG 6-10).

Both Plenary sessions will answer the following:
- Who should be educated and trained on assessments?
- What topics should be educated or trained for assessments?
- What are the best practices for assessments?
- What is needed for doctrine for assessments?

The Strategic Assessments Plenary will answer the following:

- How should the five different types of strategic assessment (CNAs, CFT, CJA, CCMD Campaign Plan, and Country Assessments) nest?
- How can CCMDs best balance the requirements of the five types of strategic assessment?
- What needs to be done to consolidate and deconflict assessment requirements?
- What staff section is best to conduct these types of assessment?

The Operational/Tactical Assessments Plenary will answer the following:

- What types of assessments are carried out (primarily operational and tactical levels)
- From which staff section do assessments come and what qualifications, rank, and reach did/should the Chief of Assessments have?
- Methods used to generate metrics that met requirements.
- How the metrics were collected and how data was validated.
- What operational and tactical decisions assessments support.
- Whether unique indicators correlated with certain desired effects.
- Effective and efficient methods to present metrics and indicators to the commander.

6. Working Groups

The underlying concept of the working groups centers on the idea of an assessment handbook with the following topic areas (including a brief description):

1. Assessment Education, Training, and Doctrine. This working group will address the issues of what education, training, and doctrine are required for assessments at all levels, addressing most issues in general terms for all assessments.

2. National Strategic Assessment (Joint Staff: JMNA, CNAs, Campaign Plans)

3. Strategic Assessment (CCMDs). These assessments tend to be performed by national government organizations or strategic headquarters such as USCENTCOM.

4. Programmatic and Country-Level Assessments. This Working Group will focus on increasing requirements to demonstrate the value of security cooperation activities, to include the FY17 NDAA requirement for SECDEF to maintain an “Assessment, Monitoring, and Evaluation (AM&E)” program in support of DOD security cooperation activities.

5. Assessment Frameworks and staff implementation. This group will focus on the staff implementation of assessments.

6. Operations Assessment (Deployed Units, Service Components and JTFs). This group will examine the assessment-related support provided to deployed headquarters (brigade level and higher) and the service components.

7. Data Visualization. This working group will share best practices and lessons learned when it comes to data visualization, in two senses - how can we visually convey an assessment, and how can we meaningfully incorporate visual analysis to strengthen that assessment?
8. **Intel and Predictive Analysis.** This working group will address recent advances in predictive analysis techniques for the assessments, intelligence, and operations research community.

9. **Polling Methods and Tools.** This working group will examine how these data are being collected, analyzed, reported, and ultimately used by decision makers.

10. **Data Collection, Metrics, Measures, and Databases.** This group’s focus will be the foundation of all assessment: data. We will explore how we understand, collect, and use data for assessments with emphasis on insights for practitioners.

Each of the working groups are described in detail at Appendix C: Working Group Descriptions. Except for the Synthesis Group, each will develop individual, more-detailed Terms of Reference specific to the assigned topic, and will be focusing on developing or refining a doctrinal chapter or equivalent product devoted to their functional area. Each topic area will stand alone so that organizations using the results can easily focus on a particular area. In other words, the event organization is not prescriptive. Instead, the approach intends to provide a “menu” from which participants can select the topic(s) that better fit into their current way of executing assessments.

7. **Products**

Several products will be generated from the workshop:

- An Executive Summary in the form of a text document and a scripted briefing for the MORS Sponsors addressing the workshop objectives, findings, conclusions and recommendations will be offered within 45 days. An article summarizing the meeting and its findings will be produced and submitted to *PHALANX* after the meeting.
- A “Handbook” consisting of the chapters prepared by the working groups and an integrating chapter prepared by the synthesis group will be produced and provided to interested organizations for use in updating assessment policy / doctrine documents.
- A general session presentation will be made at the next MORS Symposium in June 2018.

8. **Proponents**

Current proponents include the United States Special Operations Command, the United States Army, and the United States Air Force.

9. **Planning and Organizing Committee**

General Chair: LTC Marv King, AFRICOM
Co-chairpersons: Patricia Hickman, US AF/A9
                COL (R) Lynette Arnhart
                COL Allison Stewart, USSOCOM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practical Exercise Teams</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-Chair(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PE 1: Strategic Questions</th>
<th>Dr. Adam Shilling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PE 2: Standards-Based Assessments</td>
<td>USARAF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 3: Theory of Change</td>
<td>Cathryn Thurston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dr. David Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE 4: Written Assessments</td>
<td>Cathryn Thurston</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Chair</th>
<th>Co-Chair(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WG 1: Assessment Education, Training, and Doctrine</td>
<td>Mr. Jason Southerland</td>
<td>Mr. John Bott (TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 2: National Strategic Assessment (Joint Staff: JMNA, CNAs, Campaign Plans)</td>
<td>Cathryn Thurston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 3: Strategic Assessment (Joint Staff and CCMDs)</td>
<td>MAJ Natalie Casey</td>
<td>Joseph Nowak, MAJ Van Straaten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 4: Programmatic and Country-Level Assessments</td>
<td>Mr. Schutzmeister</td>
<td>Diane Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 5: Assessment Frameworks and staff implementation</td>
<td>MAJ Kristin Saling</td>
<td>Denise McDonald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 6: Operations Assessment (Deployed Commands, Service Components and JTFs)</td>
<td>Mr. Vern Bahm</td>
<td>LTC Boardman, Jake Mender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 7: Data Visualization</td>
<td>Ms. Sarah Thambidurai</td>
<td>MAJ Kevin Larrabee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 8: Intel and Predictive Analysis</td>
<td>Dr. Darryl Ahner</td>
<td>Jenni Thompson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 9: Polling Methods and Tools</td>
<td>COL Lindquist</td>
<td>MAJ Brian Harris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG 10: Data Collection, Metrics, Measures, and Databases</td>
<td>Mr. Mark Leno</td>
<td>Shawn Franklin, Janet O’May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>- Greg Keethler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Coordinators:** Ms. Susan Reardon, Chief Executive Officer, MORS  
MORS Registration: Liz Marriot  
MORS Meeting Coordinator: Jennifer Ferat  
MORS Facility: Shelby Jenkins  
MORS Security: Taniesha Sims  

**MORS Bulldog:** Ms. Renee Carlucci  

**Site Coordinators:** COL David Bradshaw, MAJ Jeffrey Dupree
Sponsor/Service Reps:

Air Force: Mr. Kevin E. Williams, Director, Studies, Analyses and Assessments (HQ USAF / A9) / Dr. Kirk G. Horton, HQ USAF/ A9

Army: Dr. W. Forrest Crain, Center for Army Analysis (HQDA/DCS G-8) / Mr. Martin Dubbs, Center for Army Analysis

Navy: Mr. Chuck P. Werchado, Deputy Director, Assessment Division (N81), Office of the Chief of Naval Operations / Mr. Herb Cupo, OPNAV (N81)

Marine Corps: Dr. George Akst, MCCDC / Dr. Michael Bailey, MCCDC

OSD: TBD, Assistant Secretary of Defense, Research and Engineering (ASD(R&E)) / Jonathan Bernays, ASD(R&E)

10. Administrative

Socializing and the free exchange of ideas are encouraged among workshop attendees. A social event will be held Thursday night with complimentary hors d’oeuvres and a cash bar.

Registration Fees
Entire Workshop:
Non-Government/Member: $675
Government/Non-Member: $650
Government/Member: $575

12. Appendices

A. Additional Definitions.
B. Reference Documents.
C. Working Group Descriptions.
APPENDIX A: (update all)

Definitions. In the United States Department of Defense, the term assessment has several definitions as shown below:

1. A continuous process that measures the overall effectiveness of employing joint force capabilities during military operations.
2. Determination of the progress toward accomplishing a task, creating a condition, or achieving an objective.
3. Analysis of the security, effectiveness, and potential of an existing or planned intelligence activity.
4. Judgment of the motives, qualifications, and characteristics of present or prospective employees or “agents.”

As in the case of the United States, NATO has several uses for the term “assessment.” Their recent handbook on performing assessments (NATO Operations Assessment Handbook 1.0, March 2011) recognized this and uses the term “operations assessment” to provide clarity in its use in the operational sense. According to the handbook, NATO uses the term “operational assessment” and it defines the term in a fashion similar to the first two entries in the US doctrinal definition shown above. This is the definition we will use at the Workshop.

There are several types of assessments. In this workshop, the concept of a type of assessment will correspond to the level of the activity of that organization. For example, the United States military in their Joint Publication 5-0, Joint Operation Planning identify the type of planning process with the level of war. Specifically, the manual identifies four levels of planning—strategic, theater strategic, operational, and tactical. In the United States, the terms “theater strategic” and “theater campaign” are interchangeable.

Planning and Responsiveness. Assessments doctrine includes campaign design, operational planning, and execution of operations. It is too late to develop an assessments plan when a Commander has to testify on campaign progress to their government or international sponsoring organization. Another area involves the ability of an assessment process to respond to the dynamics of the campaign. Operations in an area under conflict involve multiple actors, forces, and organizations and are highly dynamic. As an operation or campaign moves toward an end state the assessment measures need to morph to fit the changing environment and plan. The new measures conflict with the need to describe to the Commander how things have changed over time. The art and science needed to develop long range assessment measures (quantitative and qualitative) often challenge the staff officers and analysts—especially in regions where little to no historical information exists.

Adaptability. The ultimate measure of success for an assessment group is whether it provided relevant information to the commander and his/her staff. This implies integration with both the command’s processes and the commander’s way of thinking. Each commander has a unique way of viewing the campaign. As commanders change the assessment group must adapt their products to the current commander. A guide that provides several ways to approach assessments provides a valuable menu for the one who needs to develop, adjust, adapt, or modify their method. In the end, the assessment provides value if it accurately provides

---

2 United States Department of Defense, Joint Publication 5-0, Joint Operation Planning (Washington, DC: United States Department of Defense, 11 August 2011), Appendix D.
information that enables the commander and the command to understand the current situation and to make decisions on the future direction.

**Excessive Emphasis on Quantitative Measures.** Assumptions of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have leaned heavily on quantitative measures and data. For example, a typical measure has been the level of violence over time. However, to consider the area of assessments (especially at the campaign and strategic levels) under the sole domain of the quantitative arts provides an incomplete picture. Warfare is an art as well as a science; this statement rings especially true in the recent ongoing operations of the 21st century. A series of articles from Dr. Jon Schroden, Dr. Stephen Downes-Martin, Ben Connabbie, and others brought out major concerns about the overuse and misuse of numbers. Such concerns include the following items: (1) the linkage between quantitative measures and assessments lost a connecting logic over time, (2) the actual ability to generate a numerical measure for areas to be assessed devolved into a variation of “junk science”, (3) discussions about the assessment of an area could morph into discussion on the measure and not its impact, and (4) other concerns.3 Many of these concerns continue to exist because no action has been taken to rectify them.

**Evolving Assessment Paradigms.** There are a number changes that have occurred in the past decade as assessments have evolved. In 2011, commands across the globe started to relook their assessment processes and started moving toward a different approach. Headquarters, International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan brought in alternative perspectives (to include critics) and developed an alternative approach. Military elements in the Philippines, Horn of Africa, and elsewhere started putting forth various methodologies to address the commander’s need for an assessment. While FFRDCs issued a number of publications on the topics of improved assessments and the lessons learned in this ear, Joint and Service education, training, and doctrine have largely failed into implement many of their recommendations.

In 2015-16, each of the Combatant Commands and their respective service components produced campaign plans and implemented associated assessment plans, with some elements consolidated in the Annual Joint Assessment (AJA), formerly known as the Comprehensive Joint Assessment, run by the Joint Staff J8. In 2016-17, Joint Staff Cross-Functional Teams also implemented their own assessment processes. In 2017, OSD(P) started initiatives to conduct comprehensive country-level assessments to support security cooperation programs. Each of these large-scale assessment processes lack common leadership to deconflict tasking requirements for the CCMDs.

Additional Definitions. The following additional definitions are provided for informational purposes.

- **Assessments:**
  - A continuous process that measures the overall effectiveness of employing joint force capabilities during military operations
  - Determination of the progress toward accomplishing a task, creating a condition, or achieving an objective (JP 3-0)

---

3 All three have published on this topic; the items noted show a condensation of their insights and were incorporated into a presentation at HQ, ISAF, in 2011. Recent examples of published works include the following: Ben Connabbie, *Embracing the Fog of War: Assessment and Metrics in Counterinsurgency* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2012); Stephens Downes-Martin. “Operations Assessment in Afghanistan is Broken: What is to be Done?,” *Naval War College Review, Vol. 64, No. 4* (2011), 103-125; Jonathan Schroden, “Why Operations Assessments Fail: It’s Not Just the Metrics,” *Naval War College Review, Vol. 64, No. 4* (2011), 89-102.
• Theater campaign plans: Plans developed by geographic combatant commands that focus on the command’s steady-state activities, which include operations, security cooperation, and other activities designed to achieve theater strategic end states. It is incumbent upon geographic Combatant Commanders to ensure any supporting campaign plans address objectives in the GEF global planning effort and their respective theater campaign plans. Contingency plans for responding to crisis scenarios are treated as branch plans to the campaign plan. (DoDD 5132.01)

• Theater campaign plan assessments: Assessments will address the Combatant Commanders’ execution of the guidance contained in Reference (c) and any changes in the strategic environment that necessitate changes in DoD strategy or guidance. Assessments may be qualitative in nature. (DoDD 5132.01)

• Strategic assessment: Assessment at the Strategic Level of Command involves varying combinations of: continual measurement of strategic effects and progress towards the achievement of objectives in a military context; continual measurement of strategic progress and results in non-military domains; measurement of strategic progress and results of activities of non-military organisations; an overall evaluation of progress towards the NATO end-state; and the subsequent development of conclusions and recommendations that support strategic decision making for the strategic military commander, and informs the North Atlantic Council. (NATO Assessment Handbook)

• Tactical and operational assessment: Assessment at the operational and strategic levels typically is broader than at the tactical level (e.g., combat assessment) and uses MOEs that support strategic and operational mission accomplishment. Strategic- and operational-level assessment efforts concentrate on broader tasks, effects, objectives, and progress toward the end state. Continuous assessment helps the JFC and joint force component commanders determine if the joint force is doing the right things to achieve objectives, not just doing things right. The JFC also can use MOEs to determine progress toward success in those operations for which tactical-level combat assessment ways, means, and measures do not apply. Tactical-level assessment typically uses MOPs to evaluate task accomplishment. The results of tactical tasks are often physical in nature, but also can reflect the impact on specific functions and systems. Tactical-level assessment may include assessing progress by phase lines; neutralization of enemy forces; control of key terrain or resources; and security, relief, or reconstruction tasks. Assessment of results at the tactical level helps commanders determine operational and strategic progress, so JFCs must have a comprehensive, integrated assessment plan that links assessment activities and measures at all levels.(JP 5-0)
APPENDIX B: Reference Documents

Several recent events and activities have worked on assessments and the intent of the special meeting includes using their information as baseline information. They include (but are not limited to) the following:

Assessment Community of Interest meeting, April 2017, MacDill AFB. Attended by all the CCMDs, many interagency personnel, and the Joint Staff, the Assessments Community of Interest met to discuss common issues in assessments. CCMDs presented their assessment processes and shared best practices. The attendees agreed that there was a common demand for education, training, and doctrine for assessments across the Joint Force. In addition, a short practical exercise on how to conduct a standards-based assessment was conducted, using proposed objectives from a Joint Staff CFT Assessment.

Afghanistan Assessments Conference. This periodic meeting centers on assessment information flow and related challenges; the 3+1 Afghanistan Assessments Community (3+1 AAC) conducts these classified sessions. The term “3+1 AAC” refers to the three major multinational headquarters supporting Afghanistan [International Security Afghanistan Force (ISAF), Joint Forces Command – Brunssum (JFC-B), and the Supreme Headquarters, Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE)] plus USCENTCOM. Most of the conferences in the past have been hosted by JFC-B or USCENTCOM.

MORS 2009 Irregular Warfare Workshop. This workshop in Orlando, Florida addressed assessment frameworks and cataloged some best practices emitting from Iraq and Afghanistan. Armed with a clearer understanding of an assessment framework and data requirements, the OR community worked with the operational community to improve the assessment and data management processes in both theaters. This forum, in conjunction with other efforts, led to the discussion and inclusion of some ideas and general insights on the use of assessments in various policy and doctrinal items. By 2011, the prevailing view was to assess a campaign through the plan’s lines of effort or lines of operations (LOO) (security, governance, essential services, economic development, information operations, etc.). Associated with each LOO in the plan were corresponding measures translated into a quantitative item (number, “stop light chart”, or similar information).

NATO Operations Assessment: A Case Study Based on Planning for Transition in Afghanistan. In June of 2010 the NATO Research and Technology Organization (RTO) System Analysis and Studies (SAS) Panel established a specialist team to respond to a request from ISAF to improve data collection and sharing in Afghanistan. In July the scope expanded to include developing metrics to support decisions for the transition of responsibilities from ISAF to the Afghanistan government. The resulting study was organized according to ISAF’s four lines of operation (LOO): security, governance, rule of law, and economic development and included recommended metrics for each line of operation, a Best Practices Guide, and suggestion for improving data collection and sharing (including an enduring Data Cards project used to identify data sources).

Other Activities. Across the globe, countries and international organizations have developed information on assessments and translated it into various publications—usually as a section in their handbooks, policy documents, or doctrinal manuals. More direct examples include the NATO Assessment Handbook and the United States Department of Defense Joint Publications 3.0 and 5.0. Other publications address the need to assess operations and determine progress in a more indirect manner, such as various chapters in the United Nations Peacekeeping
Operations: Principles and Guidelines. In addition to publications, meetings and conferences to address assessments (directly or as a part of the overall operational process) occur regularly.

The following documents may provide additional background information on the topic of assessments. Those that can be accessed through an open nonclassified network are provided internet links.

**Government Publications and Papers**

Best Practices Guide V5

CJCSM 3130.01 (draft, 1 June 2012) Theater Campaign Planning – Policies and Procedures

DA ATTP 5-0.1 (14 September 2011):  
[http://armypubs.army.mil/doctrine/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/attp5_0x1.pdf](http://armypubs.army.mil/doctrine/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/attp5_0x1.pdf)

Interagency Conflict Assessment Framework  

Joint Operations: Insights and Best Practices (US Joint Forces Command)  

JP 3.0:  

JP 5.0:  
[http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp5_0.pdf](http://www.dtic.mil/doctrine/new_pubs/jp5_0.pdf)

J7-led Commander’s Handbook for Assessment Planning and Execution:  

MSTP Pamphlet 6-9

Measuring Progress in Conflict Environments (MPICE) A Metrics Framework  

[http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=interagency+conflict+assessment+framework&source=web&cd=10&ved=0CF8QFjAj&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.usaid.gov%2Fdec%2Fcontent%2FGetDoc.axed%3FCf%3DODVhZjk4NWQTM2YyMi00YjRmLTknNjktZC0tM2NDBmY2Uy%26rID%3DZ3D%26pID%3DZ3D%26attachment%3DVHJ1ZQ%3DZ3D%26rpd%3DZ3D%26mFsc2U%3D&ei=bTN7T83fN8LX0QGY-oX5Bg&usg=AFQjCNGOOnH4st59xfkX_dcZNhQo3Vrqnig](http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=interagency+conflict+assessment+framework&source=web&cd=10&ved=0CF8QFjAj&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.usaid.gov%2Fdec%2Fcontent%2FGetDoc.axed%3FCf%3DODVhZjk4NWQTM2YyMi00YjRmLTknNjktZC0tM2NDBmY2Uy%26rID%3DZ3D%26pID%3DZ3D%26attachment%3DVHJ1ZQ%3DZ3D%26rpd%3DZ3D%26mFsc2U%3D&ei=bTN7T83fN8LX0QGY-oX5Bg&usg=AFQjCNGOOnH4st59xfkX_dcZNhQo3Vrqnig)

NATO Operations Assessment Handbook

Theater Campaign Planning – Planner’ Handbook – 2012:  

AFTTP 3-3.AOC, March 2012

AFPAM 90-1603 Assessment Of Strategy, 11 November 2011
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APPENDIX C  (UPDATE ALL)

The paragraphs and questions provided below are ones for provoking thought and framing the plan for each working group. Given the limited time, a set of key objectives will be developed with the product in mind.

Working Group 1: Assessment Education, Training, and Doctrine.  This working group will address the issues of what education, training, and doctrine are required for assessments at all levels, addressing most issues in general terms for all assessments.  It will serve as the lead in answering some of the main issues for the conference. The topics it will cover are:

- State of doctrine panel discussion
- Starting assessments from scratch panel discussion
- Written Assessments
  - Writing for decision makers
  - Probabilistic reasoning and evidence
  - Biases and fallacies in decision making
  - Risk analysis
- Education and training panel discussion
- Red teaming as it pertains to assessments
- Practical lessons learned in assessments panel discussion

Working Group 2: National Strategic Assessment (Joint Staff: JMNA, CNAs, Campaign Plans)

Working Group 3: Strategic Assessment (CCMDs).  This working group will focus on the assessment performed in support of ongoing operations in a region or theater of operations (e.g., a Combatant Commander’s Area of Operations) intended to achieve theater strategic end states.  In the United States, such analysis falls under the responsibilities of a combatant commander.

The commander supported in this assessment is a national command authority, a regional commander under a strategic organization, or a US Combatant Commander (or equivalent) executing a theater campaign plan (the current U.S. lexicon) that considers ongoing security cooperation efforts, current operations, the Phase 0 component of contingency plans, and resourcing constraints as part of the combatant commander’s implementation of his strategic approach to the area of responsibility.  Theater campaign tasks are conducted by the Combatant Command, its Components, and the Services and (ideally) conducted as part of a “whole of government” strategy.

From the perspective of the United States military, these assessments are conducted to help the Combatant Commander determine whether the command has been effective in implementing its strategy.  Although (ideally) focused on the commander’s information needs, theater campaign assessments also generally provide information needed to support higher headquarters reporting requirements (e.g., SecDef engagements, Joint Staff’s annual Comprehensive Joint Assessment).  These assessments can validate or invalidate elements of the theater campaign plan’s design and confirm or deny key assumptions.  These assessments can inform broader DoD processes and analysis including strategy development, planning guidance, assignment of roles and missions, force employment, force management, force posture, and force development.  Broadly speaking, three aspects of a theater campaign assessment that a combatant command should address are performance in executing planned
tasks that support objectives, effectiveness in reaching objectives or end states and (less accepted) resource effectiveness of investments.

- What strategic decisions do assessments support? How does theater campaign assessment support/inform these decisions (e.g., frequency, format, content)?
- What constitutes a useful theater campaign assessment framework?
- What methods of theater campaign assessment have worked? What methods have not worked (and why have they not worked)?
- What is the best way to leverage (or shape?) subordinate headquarters and functional staff assessment efforts in order to inform the theater campaign assessment without unnecessarily burdening staffs?
- What is the “right” mix of qualitative and quantitative assessment at the theater campaign level?
- How does theater campaign assessment leverage and integrate whole of government (or rest of government; i.e., the DIE of DIME) assessment efforts (especially when they operate on different time horizons that combatant commands)?
- What is the balance between the assessment of task achievement (inputs?), progress toward intermediate military objectives (outputs?) and progress toward theater strategic end states (outcomes?)?
- How does theater campaign assessment deal with the “lag time” (often years, not months) and causality between an effort or set of efforts (the cause) and the results achieved (the effect)?
- What is the balance between the assessment of task achievement (inputs), progress toward intermediate military objectives (outputs) and progress toward theater strategic end states (outcomes)?
- How do CCMDs deal with the myriad of assessments tasks from the Joint Staff and OSD, and what would help them to provide better assessments?

**Working Group 4: Programmatic and Country-Level Assessments.** This Working Group will focus on increasing requirements to demonstrate the value of security cooperation activities, to include the FY17 NDAA requirement for SECDEF to maintain an “Assessment, Monitoring, and Evaluation (AM&E)” program in support of DOD security cooperation activities. Two recent and relevant documents include the 2016 issuance of DODD 5132.03 “DOD Policy and Responsibilities Relating to Security Cooperation,” that states:

- “DoD will maintain a robust program of assessment, monitoring, and evaluation of security cooperation to provide policymakers, planners, program managers, and implementers the information necessary to evaluate outcomes, identify challenges, make appropriate corrections, and maximize effectiveness of future security cooperation activities”

And the 2017 issuance of DODI 5132.14, “Assessment, Monitoring, and Evaluation Police for the Security Cooperation Enterprise,” which includes:

- Conducting initial assessments to inform initiative design and establish a baseline against which to track progress in advance of all significant security cooperation initiatives.
- Monitoring progress of significant security cooperation initiatives toward desired outcomes by tracking inputs (e.g., funding, manpower, and expertise), then determining whether programmatic milestones are achieved within anticipated timeframes, budgets, and outcomes, including whether desired results or effects are occurring within the timeframe anticipated.
Conducting centralized independent and rigorous evaluations of significant security cooperation initiatives to examine their relevance, effectiveness, and sustainability.

AM&E in the security sector often considered to be more challenging than for traditional development projects, to include dealing with high level questions of power and the use of force; data that is frequently not available for reasons of “national security”; and the USG’s and partner’s desired end state may differ slightly. Furthermore, institutional changes are long term and depend on many factors. It is often easier to observe outputs and outcomes than impact. The nature of change is iterative – in complex systems of systems, and takes time to understand root causes and develop tailored plans. Ultimately, some stakeholders may be resistant to implementing certain reforms that may threaten their own equities by altering the balance of power.

- Given data may be difficult to access due to the sensitive nature of national defense activities and their implications for national security, what data collection methods have worked?
- What are AM&E alternatives when the USG’s and partner’s desired end state may differ slightly, posing a challenge for the practitioners and partners as they design the work plan and identify objectives?
- Many desired impacts will take years to observe—well after the cessation of a specific security cooperation activity and the time frame for conducting AM&E. How would an analyst deal with the issue of time?
- What is the best way to leverage Partners that play a key role in developing indicators, measuring progress, and defining success, as they have first-hand experience with the processes, tools, structures, or concepts in question?
- What programmatic and/or country-level decisions are best supported by AM&E?
- What constitutes a useful programmatic and/or country-level AM&E framework?

Using multiple indicators to demonstrate progress toward achieving a given output, outcome, or impact strengthens the case that progress is being made and reduces the chance that project implementation will be skewed by an over-reliance on individual metrics that may not fully capture the nature of the change that is desired.

Working Group 5: Assessment Frameworks and staff implementation. This group will focus on the staff implementation of assessments. The new JP 5-0 outlines a number of meetings and working groups, to include Line Of Effort (LOE) Leads.
- Does the staff acknowledge or apply the doctrinal implementation template in JP 5-0 for staff organization or working groups?
- What staff frameworks do different commands use and why?
- What are the best practices in staff structure and implementing assessments?
- What are the common arguments resisting common best practices in staff implementation?
- What is the best size and structure of the Assessments Cell or Assessments Branch?
- Where should Operations Research Personnel work to be best effective for operations research and for assessment implementation? Are they mutually exclusive as Dr. Schroden suggests in “Why Operations Assessments Fail.”
Working Group 6: Operations Assessment (Deployed Units, Service Components and JTFs). This group will examine the assessment-related support provided to deployed headquarters (brigade level and higher) and the service components. What assessments are taking place and how are they informing senior leader decisions? We'll discuss best practices and challenges analysts face in providing timely assessments (balancing quantitative and qualitative assessments, analytic rigor versus time available, use of reach back support, etc.). The group welcomes attendees with deployed experience and/or experience working at a service component headquarters, as well as others with an interest in the topic. The format will be a mix of discussion panels, open forums, and briefings.

Working Group 7: Data Visualization. Just as important to the assessment cycle as the framework design, data collection, and analysis, is the communication of the assessment to relevant stakeholders and decision makers. How can we effectively convey important insights from the data and overall assessment in a clear and interesting way? This working group will share best practices and lessons learned when it comes to data visualization, in two senses - how can we visually convey an assessment, and how can we meaningfully incorporate visual analysis to strengthen that assessment? The following questions will be answered based on working group participant experience:

- What are the effective ways to convey analysis to non-analysts?
- How can we create visualizations that are both interesting and informative, and stay true to the analysis?
- Are there specific tools or programs that are particularly useful to employ to visualize progress?
- Can we create auto-generated visualizations to enable the concept of a continuous assessment or a 'dashboard'?
- Stoplight charts and thermographs. How can we do better?
- Quadcharts and powerpoints vs narratives. Which is the better choice?

Working Group 8: Intel and Predictive Analysis. There is an increasing demand for assessments to not only determine where we are at, but where we are going. Commanders often ask for the bellwether or leading indicator for determining the next decision point as part of the follow on for an assessment. A number of predictive analytic tools exist in this effort. This working group will address recent advances in predictive analysis techniques for the assessments, intelligence, and operations research community. It will address the following questions:

- What predictive analytic techniques exist and how should they be applied?
- What are the limits of predictive analysis for military operations and campaign plans?
- How do commands better integrate intelligence assessments and predictive analysis?
- How should the analytic community and intelligence organizations better collaborate to help commanders make better decisions?

Working Group 9: Polling Methods and Tools. The US has nearly 200,000 troops deployed to more than 170 nations. Operational efforts are at least tangentially measured by public perceptions. This working group will examine how these data are being collected, analyzed, reported, and ultimately used by decision makers. Specifically, the working group will seek to answer the following:

a. How are public perceptions measured? (Methods, sources, advantages, disadvantages, and limitations of each.)
b. How are public perceptions reported? (Depth of analysis, products, visual representation of data, role of caveats.)
c. What is the analyst’s role in increasing reliability and validity of public perception data? (Design of instrument, fieldwork supervision, data coding.)
d. How do decision makers use public perception data?
e. What other tools are being used to understand public sentiment? (Social media, web scraping, advantages / disadvantages and caveats.)

**Working Group 10: Data Collection, Metrics, Measures, and Databases**

This group’s focus will be the foundation of all assessment: data. We will explore how we understand, collect, and use data for assessments with emphasis on insights for practitioners. Areas for potential exploration include:

- What terms for data and type(s) of data should we use or not use?
- How can we bridge the gap between collecting data and improving operations?
- How can we most effectively collect, process, and employ data under real-world conditions?
- How do we use both qualitative, quantitative, and/or other types of data?
- How do we address having too much data and/or too little data?
- What are real-world examples of techniques and lessons for data collection and application?