

Date: Wed, 03 Mar 2010 11:59:26 -0500

To: "Dr. Baruch Fischhoff - Chair, National Academy of Sciences Study on Social & Behavioral Science and Improving Intelligence for National Security" <baruch@cmu.edu>,  
From: Lloyd Etheredge [lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net](mailto:lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net)

**Subject: The Measures of Effectiveness chapter; Fwd: PNSR Report**

Dear Dr. Fischhoff & Colleagues:

I am forwarding, for your review, a copy of a recent Report by the Project on National Security Reform and the New York Times overview (below). The Report was issued last fall and its (now released) recommendations include the urgent need for effectiveness measures. ["The planning arm has not yet figured out good ways to measure the effectiveness of the steps the government is taking against extremists."] This is a challenge that - beyond just beating-up the DNI system for not having such measures - our nation's best scientific minds might help to address.

I have raised earlier, from several dimensions, concerns about measures of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. We are spending \$75 billion/year and other governments, including allied governments with strong concerns about similar vulnerabilities, have totals that will increase this astonishing annual total. If we were to know now - and ask *de novo* - Thomas Friedman's question of how much we should spend/year in response to a small jihadist death cult with several hundred members, what ballpark numbers would the National Academy of Sciences realistically recommend to the American people?

I know this is a challenging task. But it can begin with using numerators and denominators and analyzing shifts at the margin. Could The US cut \$5 billion/year from its own budget without notable deterioration in security? \$15 billion? Could we reasonably shift \$100 million/year to academic social science & new data systems in the public domain to help the government and our democratic processes become more intelligent? So much of this money goes into data systems and analysis & related personnel. Can the National Academy should give us some guidance, after two years, re rational budgets?

Lloyd Etheredge  
-----

February 22, 2010. NY Times

## Hurdles Hinder Counterterrorism Center

By ERIC SCHMITT and THOM SHANKER

WASHINGTON — The nation's main counterterrorism center, created in response to the intelligence failures in the years before Sept. 11, is struggling because of flawed staffing and internal cultural clashes, according to a new study financed by Congress.

The result, the study concludes, is a lack of coordination and communication among the agencies that are supposed to take the lead in planning the fight against terrorism, including the C.I.A. and the State Department. The findings come just weeks after the National Counterterrorism Center was criticized for missing clear warning signs that a 23-year-old Nigerian man was said to be plotting to blow up a Detroit-bound commercial airliner on Dec. 25.

The counterterrorism center's mission is to gather information from across the government, pull it all together and assess terrorist threats facing the United States, then develop a plan for the government to combat them. But the new report found that the center's planning arm did not have enough authority to do its main job of coordinating the White House's counterterrorism priorities.

The center's planning operation is supposed to be staffed by representatives of various agencies, but not all of them send their best and brightest, the report said. It also cited examples in which the C.I.A. and the State Department did not even participate in some plans developed by the center that were later criticized for lacking important insights those agencies could offer.

As a result, the center's planning arm "has been forced to develop national plans without the expertise of some of the most important players," the report determined.

The counterterrorism center was part of the overhaul of the government after Sept. 11, including the creation of the director of national intelligence. Now, years after the attacks, the entire reorganization is coming under scrutiny, raising fundamental questions about who is in charge of the nation's counterterrorism policy and its execution.

“The fluid nature of modern terrorism necessitates an agile and integrated response,” the report concluded. “Yet our national security system is organized along functional lines (diplomatic, military, intelligence, law enforcement, etc.) with weak and cumbersome integrating mechanisms across these functions.”

The 196-page report is the result of an eight-month study by the Project on National Security Reform, a nonpartisan research and policy organization in Washington. It was financed by Congress and draws on more than 60 interviews with current and former government and Congressional officials, including nearly a dozen officials at the counterterrorism center. The study is scheduled to be made public this week. The authors provided a copy to The New York Times.

The center noted in a statement on Monday that the study found the center had “made progress” in linking national policy with operations, adding that the report’s recommendations “provide an extremely thoughtful and useful critique of how counterterrorism actions are or are not fully synchronized across the U.S. government.”

The report found that the center’s planning arm struggled with “systemic impediments” like overlapping statutes, culture clashes with different agencies and tensions with two formidable players: the State Department’s counterterrorism office and the C.I.A.

Under President Obama, the report determined, counterterrorism issues have become more decentralized within the National Security Council’s different directorates, leaving the counterterrorism center’s planning arm to collect and catalog policies and operations going on at the C.I.A., the Pentagon and the Departments of State and Homeland Security, rather than help shape overall government strategy.

The planning arm has not yet figured out good ways to measure the effectiveness of the steps the government is taking against extremists. “The basic but fundamental question remains unanswered: How is the United States doing in its attempt to counter terrorism?” the report concluded. And the study is critical of Congress for failing to create committees that cut across national security issues. The planning arm “lacks a champion in either chamber of Congress,” the report found.

Since the counterterrorism center was created in 2004, its planning arm has been largely focused on a comprehensive review to assign counterterrorism roles and re-

sponsibilities to each federal agency, producing then revising a document called the National Implementation Plan. But pointedly, the counterterrorism center does not direct any specific operations.

Since the completion of that longer-term project, the study's authors found that the center's 100-person planning arm had become more involved in immediate counterterrorism issues: working on various classified projects involving Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and threats to the United States at home.

The study called on Mr. Obama to issue an executive order to define the nation's counterterrorism architecture in order to address some of the problems and improve coordination. It also recommended giving the center's director, currently Michael E. Leiter, a say in the choice of counterterrorism officials at other federal agencies, a step the 9/11 Commission had recommended but was not adopted.

The report was directed by Robert S. Kravinsky, a Pentagon planner on assignment to the group, and James R. Locher III, a former Pentagon official and senior Congressional aide who is the group's president.

Until they joined the administration, Gen. James L. Jones, Mr. Obama's national security adviser, and Dennis C. Blair, the director of national intelligence, were members of the group's board of advisers, which now includes Newt Gingrich, the former House speaker, and Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser to the first President Bush.

Dr. Lloyd S. Etheredge - Director, Government Learning Project  
Fellow - World Academy of Art & Science  
Policy Sciences Center Inc.  
127 Wall St., Room 322 - Box 208215  
New Haven, CT 06520-8215  
URL: [www.policyscience.net](http://www.policyscience.net)  
301-365-5241 (v); [lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net](mailto:lloyd.etheredge@policyscience.net) (email)