

Defining Integrated Operations

Richard D. Downie

Director, Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies

“If language is not correct, then what is said is not meant; if what is said is not what is meant, then what must be done remains undone; if this remains undone, morals and art will deteriorate; if justice goes astray, the people will stand about in helpless confusion. Hence there must be no arbitrariness in what is said. This matters above everything.”

Confucius

Confucius emphasizes that the lack of clear language causes confusion and possibly disastrous consequences. As military, interagency and multinational operations become more complex and “integrated,” we need to say what we mean. In this vein, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, General Richard Myers, USAF, has taken an important step to help clarify terms, although this article argues that more steps are necessary. General Myers has noted that we operate on non-military and cross-border fronts, involving law enforcement, diplomacy and finance, and we need to “transform our military competencies from joint operations to *integrated operations*” [emphasis added].¹ He also mentions the requirement for standardization across the joint force to maximize effectiveness. One of the first—and easiest—things that we can standardize is the terminology we use to define important, though perhaps amorphous, operational concepts. In the past we have loosely defined what are considered *interagency operations*. But what are “integrated operations”—and for that matter, what are interagency operations? Distinctions matter as we more frequently conduct operations that include counterparts from U.S. government and non-government agencies, private industry, and perhaps more importantly, partners from allied countries and international organizations.

Toward the Chairman’s goal of standardization, this commentary offers the following taxonomy of terms to describe various types of interagency and integrated operations. The intent is to generate discussion on how to standardize the way we define and address such operations. The faculty of the Center for Hemispheric Defense Studies at the National Defense University developed the terms. We based our approach on differentiation and categorization of the entities participating rather than on the functional objective of an operation (such as peacekeeping, disaster relief, or counterterrorism).

¹Richard B. Myers, “A Word from the Chairman,” *Joint Force Quarterly*, no. 37 (April, 2005), p.5.

Defining Integrated Operations

TABLE 1: Proposed Taxonomy

<u>Proposed Term</u>	<u>National</u>	<u>International</u>
Joint	Multiple Service, Military-Only Operations (1 Country)	
Combined		Multiple Country, Military-Only Operations
Federal Interagency Operations	Mil + Federal Agencies	
Domestic Interagency Operations	Mil + Fed+ State + Local	
National Integrated Operations	Mil +Fed + State+Local +NGO+Private Industry	
Combined Integrated Operations		Mil+Nat'l Gov't Agencies, Multiple Countries
Multinational Integrated Operations		Mil +Nat'l + State + Local +NGOs + IGOs + MNCs, Multiple Countries

Taxonomy of Terms

Joint operations, combined operations. The explanations of the taxonomy start with basic terms on which most agree, then proceed to more contentious ones. Most members of defense and security community routinely recognize and use the terms *joint* and *combined*. The Department of Defense (DOD), in its *Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms* defines *joint operations* as military actions conducted by joint forces or by service forces working together. The definition implies actions by the military forces of a single country. For instance, Operation *Just Cause* in Panama in 1989 was a joint operation that involved the elements of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marines in a coordinated effort. The DOD Dictionary refers to *combined operations* as those conducted by military forces of two or more allied nations acting together for the accomplishment of a single mission. Operation *Desert Storm* in 1991, designed to oust Iraqi forces from Kuwait, was considered a combined operation, as it involved a coalition of forces from the United States, Europe, the Middle East, and other regions.

Interagency operations. The lack of precision starts with the use of the term *interagency operations*, which I contend currently serves as an umbrella over various

Defining Integrated Operations

types of operations that should be defined and named separately. The term *interagency operations* evokes operations involving a variety of agencies; without further explanation, one might assume he understands the type of participants or agencies involved. Indeed, two individuals could conduct a discussion with very different impressions. What the specific operation includes or does not include is unclear. The receiver must ask additional questions. The divergence between what each of the two speakers is saying may not be very pronounced if the two individuals are from the same military service, or even between military services working on the same staff. However, when a military official talks with his counterpart from the Department of State or the Department of Justice, there is great potential for misperception and confusion; that potential increases dramatically when we are talking with an international counterpart.

Federal interagency operations. A military colleague recently responded to my assertion that *interagency operations* is a vague term by declaring that joint staff officers have a common understanding of the expression and routinely use it. Without missing a beat, he defined interagency operations as those that involve two or more U.S. federal agencies – a worthy response. Clearly, an interagency operation can involve only federal agencies. Take the example of a counterdrug operation to interdict a suspected narcotrafficker boat moving through Caribbean waters toward the U.S. coastline. An Air Force airborne warning and control system or Navy P-3 aircraft may identify a suspicious boat and pass the information on to the Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF-S) Operations Center. U.S. Customs, the Department of Justice, and other federal agencies manning that operations center may direct a Coast Guard or Navy vessel to intercept the boat. Then if drugs are found, Coast Guard or federal law enforcement officers seize them and apprehend the traffickers. Such interagency operations are conducted frequently at JIATF-S, a true interagency task force located in Key West, Florida, and commanded by a Coast Guard admiral, as well as many other places every day. Within my colleague's definition, interagency operations can either include the military or not. For clarification, our taxonomy in the table refers to such operations, involving only U.S. Government agencies as *Federal interagency operations*.

Domestic interagency operations. However, others call operations that include state and local authorities as well as federal entities interagency operations. For example, there are 16 joint terrorism task forces across the United States that link the efforts and intelligence available to the military and to federal, state, and local law enforcement departments². The intent is to permit these task forces to prevent, or respond more effectively to, terrorist threats and activities. So how does one distinguish between those operations that involve only federal agencies and those involving state and local authorities? Our taxonomy describes operations including entities at the federal, state and local levels as *domestic interagency operations*.³

² Note that the use of *joint* in this example of joint terrorism task forces is not consistent with the military usage, which again highlights the requirement for standardization across all participants.

³ Although the Intergovernmental Personnel Act uses *intergovernmental operations* to describe activities involving governments at the federal, state, and local levels, this phrase fails to distinguish

Defining Integrated Operations

Integrated operations. Recognizing the need to bring greater precision to how we describe various types of operations, General Myers coined the term *integrated operations*. After introducing the phrase *enhanced jointness*, he later defined integrated operations to highlight the participation of entities other than military forces:

“The term joint once referred to multiple services working together. That is the baseline. Many services, federal agencies, corporations, and nongovernmental organizations must cooperate to meet the full spectrum of military operations, from peacekeeping to battle to the transition to a lasting peace.”⁴

This distinction is useful. Nevertheless, the question becomes when and how interagency operations evolve into integrated operations. That is, where do integrated operations begin and interagency operations stop? An obvious divide is between operations involving one country and those involving more than one.

National integrated operations. While General Myers’ strict definition of integrated operations focuses on multinational operations, we also need to distinguish and describe operations that involve many disparate participants within the confines of one country. The relief effort following Hurricane Andrew in Florida in 1992 involved federal, state, and local emergency management and law enforcement entities, the military, the Coast Guard, and nongovernmental organizations such as the Red Cross, not to mention private businesses and churches across the country. To distinguish between integrated operations within one nation and those involving multiple countries, our taxonomy sets *national integrated operations* apart from *multi-national integrated operations*.

Combined integrated operations. Some in the defense and security community currently use *joint*, *interagency*, *multinational* to describe a type of operation that also fits in the *integrated operation* category. This variant involves multiple military services and government-level entities from more than one sovereign country—but no nongovernmental entities. An example would be the Military Observer Mission, Ecuador-Peru. This multinational peacekeeping effort helped resolve a border conflict that erupted between Ecuador and Peru in 1995. Representatives of military forces and of foreign affairs and defense ministries from Argentina, Brazil, Chile and the United States monitored and coordinated this groundbreaking accomplishment. While our taxonomy could have used the term, *joint*, *interagency*, *multinational*, for the sake of consistency—and to identify clearly this variant as an integrated operation – we selected the term *combined integrated operation*.

Multinational integrated operations. General Myers’ definition of integrated operations actually refers to a multinational operation. A prime example is the international relief effort responding to the tsunami in Southeast Asia in late 2004. This initiative included military forces and government agencies from many nations;

varieties of domestic municipal, state, regional, and provincial governments from sovereign national governments.

⁴Richard B. Myers, “A Word from the Chairman,” *Joint Force Quarterly*, no. 36 (December, 2004), p. 10.

Defining Integrated Operations

nongovernmental agencies such as the International Red Cross, OXFAM and CARE; international governmental organizations (IGOs), including the United Nations; and private industry partners who donated aid and relief supplies. The postwar reconstruction effort in Iraq, also called a *stability and support operation*, falls into this category. In addition to the militaries of many coalition countries accomplishing a variety of tasks, governmental agencies such as the U.S. Departments of State, Justice and Defense work with their Iraqi counterparts at the national, regional and municipal levels. IGOs such as the United Nations are involved in election assistance, while many multinational companies take on tasks ranging from fixing oil field machinery to constructing and repairing buildings, roads, power grids, and other infrastructure projects. In short, our taxonomy labels what General Myers calls an *integrated operation* as a *multinational integrated operation*.

Returning to the opening quotation, Confucius exhorts us to avoid arbitrary statements. In that spirit, and with General Myers' effort to achieve standardization in mind, this commentary seeks to provoke debate on how to describe more accurately and efficiently today's nontraditional operations. While we have tried to capture the variety of interagency and integrated operations based on the participants involved, there are other ways to approach such a categorization. Moreover, there will be disagreement on the terms. Some may question whether a separate category is warranted if one or more participants listed in a type of operation is missing.⁵ Such issues and the discussions they generate will help bring greater precision to how the defense and security community understands and discusses interagency and integrated operations. As the Chairman's term *integrated operations* reflects the growing participation of disparate national and international entities, achieving clarity is increasingly important to building greater understanding, unity, and interoperability with interagency, nongovernmental and foreign counterparts.

⁵ In other words, does that fact that a nongovernmental or an international governmental organization does not participate mean that the activity is not a multinational integrated operation?