

**Testimony for HASC O&I Subcommittee Hearing**  
**October 30, 2007**  
**Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Stability Operations Capabilities**  
**Celeste Ward**

Good morning, Chairman Snyder, Ranking Member Akin, members of the Subcommittee. It is an honor to be asked to testify in front of this distinguished panel, and I am pleased to be here today to address a compelling issue for the Department and the U.S. Government.

Experiences in Iraq, Afghanistan and other theaters have signaled to the Department of Defense the need to adapt our government institutions so they are better able to face current challenges to our national security and foreign policy interests. As Secretary of Defense Gates noted recently, “Our military must be prepared to undertake the full spectrum of operations – including unconventional or irregular campaigns – for the foreseeable future. [And] the non-military instruments of America’s national power need to be rebuilt, modernized, and committed to the fight.”<sup>1</sup>

In 2005, the Department issued DoD Directive 3000.05 “Military Support to Security, Stability, Transition, and Reconstruction Operations,” by which the Department was instructed to accord stability operations priority comparable to major combat operations. This guidance was to accompany National Security Presidential Directive-44 (NSPD-44), by which the State Department is leading the development of civilian capabilities and integration with military capabilities to plan, prepare for, and conduct stabilization and reconstruction missions.

Since DoD Directive 3000.05 was signed, the Department has taken steps to implement the Directive’s vision by focusing on those areas most likely to generate systemic change throughout our Armed Forces, including: planning, doctrine, training and education, organization, intelligence, and information sharing. Some example initiatives from the past two years are the development of a Joint Operating Concept for Security, Stability, Transition, and Reconstruction and integration of stability operations into Joint and Service capstone doctrine; an Army Action Plan for Stability Operations to provide critical decision points for the development of Army capabilities; adaptation of training and education to increase the focus on non-kinetic activities, cross-cultural communications, and civil-military operations; enhanced intelligence capabilities through use of social science expertise; and inclusion of stability operations in key strategic documents to influence resourcing decisions.

The Department has also supported implementation of NSPD-44 by detailing personnel to the State Department’s Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization (S/CRS). These personnel are exploring new interagency concepts for reconstruction and stabilization by providing a testing ground through the Unified Action experimentation series led by U.S. Joint Forces Command (USJFCOM) and by developing a DoD Work Plan to Support NSPD-44 to ensure DoD expertise is appropriately leveraged and interagency efforts led by S/CRS are integrated into evolving DoD capabilities. I am happy to address these issues in further detail as you wish.

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates, Marine Corps Association Annual Dinner, July 18, 2007

Even though such steps have been undertaken, we still have much work ahead of us to implement DoD Directive 3000.05. We recognize such an evolution of our military capabilities requires change throughout the Department, which may take years to realize fully. As we examine the capabilities the military requires, we must define the appropriate role for the military in these types of whole-of-government operations and, particularly, the role of our General Purpose Forces in facing a variety of irregular challenges that were previously the sole purview of our Special Operations Forces. We are also focused on the adjustments to our institutions that are required for improved training and advising capabilities as well as civil-military integration.

In pressing forward with this work, we are looking to integrate lessons not just from Afghanistan and Iraq, but also other historical missions. We are aware that on the ground today, as in previous conflicts, our military and civilian personnel are devising ingenious adaptations to address the challenges they face. It is my office's role to examine which of those adaptations must be institutionalized so we are better prepared in the future.

Organizing, training, equipping, and advising indigenous armies and police have become key missions for the military as a whole and no longer niche missions for our Special Operations Forces. Per the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review, we are working to ensure General Purpose Forces are structured and prepared for these new roles, while maintaining an appropriate balance with capabilities oriented toward more traditional missions. Examples include the establishment of the Kabul Counterinsurgency Academy to teach counterinsurgency best practices to U.S., NATO, Coalition, and Afghan troops and the training programs of U.S. embedded advisors for Iraq underway at Ft. Riley and 29 Palms.

Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs) in Afghanistan and Iraq are a key civil-military adaptation that we are examining. As we work with S/CRS in implementing NSPD-44, we aim to take the best from that tool set in order to build even more effective civil-military teams that can help respond to a variety of contingencies in the future. We are also looking at ways to expand upon our tactical, military-oriented lessons learned collection capabilities to develop a government-wide process to capture and disseminate lessons learned on interagency operations. Such a tool is critical in our efforts to institutionalize the best adaptations emerging from the battlefields of Afghanistan and Iraq.

In order for field-level civil-military integration to be effective, we need higher-level integration throughout our planning and our capabilities development processes. We are making progress on this front. We have worked with S/CRS closely on their development of a Planning Framework for Reconstruction, Stabilization, and Conflict Transformation, an Essential Task Matrix for operations, and the Interagency Management System for Reconstruction & Stabilization – a standard structure to coordinate planning and operations across multiple levels of the U.S. government, including integrated, interagency civil-military teams in the field. This construct was approved by Senior Leaders earlier this year and continues to undergo testing and refinement, partially through inclusion in military exercises. Within the Department, my office has played a key role in ensuring early and effective inclusion of civilian agency expertise and incorporation of stability operations into all relevant aspects of military strategic and operational planning.

As stated in DoD Directive 3000.05, the Department of Defense may be called upon to fill some gaps in U.S. government capabilities for stabilization missions in the short-term during operations and when civilians are unable to provide capabilities. Strategic success in such operations, however, will only be possible with a complete architecture for unified civil-military planning, deployment, and action – from the earliest time possible -- and dedication of the resources necessary to create and expand the expeditionary capabilities of civilian agencies. We need a strong civilian partner to deal with conflict and instability not only alongside the military but before they become military requirements.

As I move forward in my role as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Stability Operations Capabilities my priorities are to use the lessons we have learned from past and current operations around the globe to ensure we have the right mix of capabilities within the General Purpose Force, improve training and advising capabilities, advance civil-military integration, and institutionalize the best practices for military contributions to stabilization and reconstruction operations.