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Overview

• Sample size varies by question, since all non-demographic questions did not require responses
  • Varies between 700-900; labeled for each
• The survey was open from Friday, March 4 until Friday, March 11
• Legislative branch under-represented in respondent pool.
• Only outlining topline results today for each of the questions in the survey and displaying responses across major demographic groups.
Survey Results: Guiding Principles I

Rank the following guiding principles that you believe should inform any new DoD reforms.

1. Improving personnel management
2. Balancing military "supply" and "demand"
3. Increasing the efficiency and effective management of DoD systems
4. Improving the effectiveness of joint military operations
5. Ensuring independence of military advice
6. Maintaining civilian authority
7. Ensuring quality of military advice
8. Improving strategy formulation and contingency planning

Average Ranking Rating
Survey Results: Guiding Principles III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principle</th>
<th>Average Ranking Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining civilian authority</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring quality of military advice</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring independence of military advice</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the effectiveness of joint military operations</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balancing military &quot;supply&quot; and &quot;demand&quot;</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the efficiency and effective management of DoD systems</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving strategy formulation and contingency planning</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving personnel management</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guiding Principle Ratings across Major Demographic Groups

- Legislative branch
- Executive branch - military
- Executive branch - civilian
- Other
- Rating Average
Survey Results: Guiding Principles IV

Ranking the Guiding Principle of Maintaining Civilian Authority

- Executive branch - civilian: 3.17
- Executive branch - military: 3.65
- Legislative branch: 3.58
- Other: 3.69
Survey Results: Guiding Principles V

Ranking the Guiding Principle of Independence of Military Advice

- Executive branch - civilian: 4.31
- Executive branch - military: 4.02
- Legislative branch: 4.85
- Other: 4.46
Survey Results: Guiding Principles VI

Ranking the Guiding Principle of Efficiency and Effective Management of DoD Systems

- **Executive branch - civilian**: 4.87
- **Executive branch - military**: 4.88
- **Legislative branch**: 3.81
- **Other**: 4.32

Average Ranking Rating
Survey Results: Reform Opportunities

Select and rank order five of the following issues based on the opportunity for improvement through reform.

- Acquisition process
- Strategy
- DoD Programming and budgeting processes
- Efficiency of DoD
- Effectiveness of military operations
- Interagency process
- Agility of DoD
- Joint requirements process
- Military personnel system
- Role clarity among actors
- Contingency/war planning
- Quality of military advice
- Civil-military balance
- Civilian personnel system
- Independence of the CJCS

Least likely to generate improvements from reform to Most likely to generate improvements from reform.
Survey Results: Reform Opportunities II

Total Response Counts

Number of Total Responses

- Acquisition process
- DoD programming and budgeting processes
- Efficiency of DoD
- Strategy
- Effectiveness of military operations
- Interagency process
- Agility of DoD
- Joint requirements process
- Contingency/war planning
- Military personnel system
- Role clarity among actors
- Quality of military advice
- Civilian personnel system
- Civil-military balance
- Independence of the CJCS
Survey Results: Reform Opportunities III

Opportunity for Reform across Major Demographic Groups 1

- Effectiveness of military operations
- Strategy
- Contingency/war planning
- Independence of the CJCS
- Quality of military advice
- Efficiency of DoD
- Agility of DoD

Average Score (0-5)

Legislative branch
Executive branch - military
Executive branch - civilian
Other
Average Rating
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Survey Results: Strength of Institutions I

Assessing the needs of the Defense Department, rate the current strength of the following institutions.

- Secretary of Defense: 5.02
- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff: 4.41
- Combatant Commanders: 5.15
- Service Chiefs: 4.58
- Service Secretaries: 4.85
- National Security Council Staff: 6.87

Too Weak | Just Right | Too Strong
Survey Results: Strength of Institutions II

Strength of Institution Ratings across Demographics

- Too Strong
- Just Right
- Too Weak

Institutional Roles:
- Secretary of Defense
- Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff
- Combatant Commanders
- Service Chiefs
- Service Secretaries
- National Security Council Staff

Branches:
- Legislative branch
- Executive branch - military
- Executive branch - civilian
- Other

Rating Average
Survey Results: Size of Institutions I

Relative to the appropriate responsibilities of each institution, rate your assessment of the size of each of the following:

- OSD
- Joint Staff
- Combatant Commands
- Service Staffs
- National Security Council Staff

Too Small | Just Right | Too Large
Survey Results: Size of Institutions II

Size of Institution Ratings across Demographics

Too Large

Just Right

Too Small

OSD
Joint Staff
Combatant Commands
Service Staffs
National Security Council Staff

Legislative branch
Executive branch - military
Executive branch - civilian
Other
Rating Average
Survey Results: Interagency System I

Rate the effectiveness of the White House-led interagency system at the following:

- Strategy development
- Evaluation/assessment of policy
- Budgeting and resource management
- Policy implementation
- Policy development
- Decisions on the use of military force and forces
- Confirmation and political appointment processes

Scale:
- 1: Wholly Ineffective
- 1.5
- 2
- 2.5
- 3
- 3.5
- 4
- 4.5
- 5: Highly Effective
Survey Results: Interagency System II

Executive Interagency System Ratings across Demographics

- Budgeting and resource management
- Confirmation and political appointment processes
- Strategy development
- Policy development
- Policy implementation
- Decisions on the use of military force and forces
- Evaluation/assessment of policy

Legend:
- Legislative branch
- Executive branch - military
- Executive branch - civilian
- Other
- Rating Average

Ratings:
- Wholly ineffective
- Highly effective
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Survey Results: Congressional Oversight I

Rate the effectiveness of the following aspects of congressional oversight of the Department of Defense:

- Strategy development
- Use of force authorization processes (e.g., AUMF)
- Policy development
- Confirmation and political appointment processes
- Evaluation/assessment of policy
- Budgeting and resource management
- Routine oversight of DoD policies and programs

1. Wholly Ineffective
2. Highly Ineffective
Survey Results: Role Clarity I

Rate the degree of role clarity today within DoD in the following categories:

- Planning for cross-regional operations: 2.5
- Communications with other interagency actors: 2.5
- Executing cross-regional operations: 3.0
- Establishment and enforcement of joint requirements: 2.5
- Approval for programmatic and acquisition issues: 3.0
- Communications with Congress: 3.0
- Communications with POTUS: 3.0
- Approval for the use of force or forces: 3.5
- Executing direct/indirect military actions: 3.5

Totally Unclear

Crystal Clear
Survey Results: Role Clarity II

Role Clarity Ratings across Demographics

- Crystal Clear
- Totally Unclear

- Planning for cross-regional operations
- Executing cross-regional operations
- Communications with Congress
- Communications with POTUS
- Communications with other interagency actors
- Executing direct/indirect military actions
- Approval for the use of force or forces
- Approval for programmatic and acquisition issues
- Establishment and enforcement of joint requirements

Legislative branch
Executive branch - military
Executive branch - civilian
Other
Rating Average
Possible FY2017 NDAA “Quick Wins”

- Efficiencies
  - A-76 authority (statute)
  - Study on whether DoD should opt-out its civilian personnel system from OPM (like IC and Foreign Service) (statute)
  - BRAC (statute)
  - Enhance flexibility in meeting joint duty requirements (statute or SD)
  - Consider consolidating war colleges (statute or SD)

- Innovation
  - Change to SASC rules governing conflict of interest divestment for incoming DoD appointees (SASC)
  - Create a “bishop’s fund” overseen by DSD for innovative experiments in support of joint warfighting, with competition open to all components (statute or SD)

- Command and control
  - Upgrade CYBERCOM and SPACECOM to unified combatant commands, sourced without growth in military or civilian end-strength or HQ personnel and using existing facilities (statute or SD)

- Strategy and planning
  - Task CJCS to develop for SD approval prioritized, synchronized cross-regional/functional plans (SD)
  - Increase cadre of planners in services and JS (SD)
  - Task Service Chiefs to join SD milestone approval meetings for OPLANs/CONPLANs (SD)

- Defense reform way ahead
  - Task DoD, independent study, and/or independent commission in areas of key congressional interest, timed to influence consideration in the FY19 NDAA cycle, e.g.
    - Defense efficiencies in the areas of supply chain, healthcare, and education benefit for families
    - Efficiencies in defense intelligence agencies
    - Combatant Command structure, including: possible mergers, HQ efficiencies, the appropriate placement of responsibilities formerly owned by JFCOM, and the appropriateness of the current UCP in light of complex global challenges
    - Civilian and military personnel systems