Three one-day workshops were conducted. Each workshop contained 10-12 people drawn from some element of the long-range planning community, the Army Staff, and in at least one session, the Army Secretariat. Uniformed participants ranged in rank from major to colonel, while civil servants were generally in the GS-13 to GS-15 range.

Some workshop participants stood out as sharply critical of Army intelligence, characterizing it as “broken.” As a result, we sought to gather additional views to see if this was a common perception, and we found that the pointedness of their charges was not echoed elsewhere. For example, none of the criticisms we heard during our e-mail canvassing of the acquisition community indicated that these sentiments were broadly shared. Similarly, the 1995 APINS found no support for the characterization of Army intelligence as broken; 100 percent of the respondents said they were getting at least some of the intelligence support they needed, and 51 percent perceived Army intelligence as improving in its accuracy, timeliness, quality, and responsiveness.¹

FIRST WORKSHOP

Key Questions

The focus of the first workshop was strategic planning. The planners identified the following as the most important questions to which they would need answers:

About resources:

- Has the incoming skill base of recruits significantly changed training requirements?
- Have budget levels damaged the Army’s ability to expand?

About the nature of warfare:

- Are there viable asymmetric strategies that threaten U.S. interests?
- Can MOOTW be accomplished with forces designed for warfighting?
- Has information warfare become a viable military weapon?
- Is the United States still dominant in space?
- Is the offense still dominant?
- Does maneuver still predominate over fire power?

About the international environment:

- Beyond U.S. unilateral capabilities, does our alliance structure allow us to secure the full range of our interests?

About the threat:

- Will there be a threatening regional hegemon?
- Will the United States have a global peer competitor?

About capabilities:

- Are we still generally ahead in measures/countermeasures?
Current Problems with Intelligence

Planners quickly found consensus that Army intelligence is broken at a systemic level—organizational, process, products, and other factors all contribute to this. It needs to be rethought from the top down.

- The system is not organized, structured, or supplied with incentives to support long-range planning, and there are no easy solutions to making it more responsive to these needs. Intelligence supplied is not what is needed to operate, nor what is needed to plan.

- Title 10 (Army) needs differ from warfighters’ needs in significant ways, but there is little recognition of this or its implications in the way the Army is organized for intelligence support to long-range planning.

- While it may be useful for commanders and others, much of the technology-heavy, expensive imagery and SIGINT is useless in intelligence support to long-range planning. Much better value for money could be had by taking some of that money and supporting more analysts/analysis, training and professional development, and support for tiger teams for crisis operations support.

- A narrow focus on canonical approved scenarios (the Defense Planning Guidance’s Illustrative Planning Scenarios) is less useful than a more realistic menu of more likely ones.

- Organizational lines blur distinctions between support for crisis operations and support for planning—this means that the analysts who would be doing intelligence analysis for planning are always putting out the crisis du jour. The solution is organizational—isolate intelligence support to long-range planning from the daily fire drills.

- The focus of the Chief of Staff should be institutional and futures oriented, not getting up to speed on operations. Intelligence support should be helping to support the Chief’s vision of the total Army for the future.

- Military Intelligence (MI) in particular needs to be rethought, reorganized. Are there too many MI units? Too many people in MI?
• There needs to be more interaction between planners and intelligence across the board, through serving on same working groups, cross-briefing of communities, and so on. Only this can sensitize intelligence staff to planners’ needs, and planners to intelligence’s capabilities.

• Planning needs to be more capabilities-based than it is now.

• In a world where Third World sideshows (peacekeeping, humanitarian, and similar operations) dominate, “intentions” are more important than “capabilities”—bad intentions and a low-tech sniper’s rifle (or a radio-controlled mine) can ruin a commander’s day, and compromise the political viability of the operation.

• HUMINT, SIGINT, and COMINT may be more important in a world of these Third World contingencies, because they can be revealing of “intentions.”

• There are no mechanisms for institutional learning and training—when a new analyst comes in, he faces a clean slate. There need to be supporting systems that capture both substantive knowledge and indexed knowledge (e.g., directory of analysts/offices that provide information, indexes and abstracts of relevant publications).

• In the absence of a threat, force structure is still organized around warfighting.

SECOND WORKSHOP

Key Questions

The second workshop was geared to acquisition and force development officials. Their key questions fell into five categories: geostrategic, technological, human-organizational, nature of warfare, and domestic.

Geostrategic:

• Has the United States been involved in a major theater war?

• Is the continuance of the United States as a global nation-state threatened?
• Have there been asymmetrical conflicts against the United States or its forces?
• Is resource scarcity a primary cause of conflict?
• Has there been a change in the global environment that dramatically affects warfighting?
• Has China emerged as a near-peer competitor?
• Have there been major global alignments or realignments?

**Domestic:**
• Has the United States been confronted with an insurgency at home?
• Is there domestic consensus on the U.S. military role in the world?

**Nature of warfare:**
• Has the United States been confronted with an insurgency at home?
• Has there been a change in the global environment that dramatically affects warfighting?

**Technology:**
• Has technology had a major impact on organizational structures and values?