

# ALLIES

ALLIANCE LINKING LEADERS IN EDUCATION AND THE SERVICES



## SIMULATION EXERCISE



# ALLIES

ALLIANCE LINKING LEADERS IN EDUCATION AND THE SERVICES



## ALLIES SIMULATION EXERCISE 2009

### PARTICIPANT HANDBOOK

#### CONTENTS

Program Information .....	3
Introduction And Non-Attribution Statement .....	4
Definitions .....	4
Game Concept .....	5
Rules Of Engagement .....	7
Schedule .....	8
National Security Council Staff Backgrounder.....	9

FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

## PROGRAM INFORMATION

**ALLIES** is an undergraduate led initiative that creates a bridge for shared understanding between future civilian and military leaders. The Intellectual Roundtable, ALLIES' capstone event, brings together practitioners from the military, civilian government, civil society, and private sector with the academic community—from professors to civilian and military students. Together, through the use of guided, small-group discussions in conjunction with panel presentations, these disparate groups come together to discuss issues surrounding civil-military relations, relevant to all parts of society. This year, for the first time, the Intellectual Roundtable will be hosted by the Stockdale Center for Ethical Leadership and the Center for Middle East and Islamic Studies at the United States Naval Academy.

The **National Defense University (NDU)** educates military and civilian leaders through teaching, research, and outreach in national security strategy, national military strategy, and national resource strategy; joint and multinational operations; information strategies, operations, and resource management; acquisition; and regional defense and security studies.

The **Institute for National Strategic Studies (INSS or the Institute)** is a policy research and strategic gaming organization within NDU serving the U.S. Department of Defense, its components, and interagency partners. The Institute provides timely, objective analysis and gaming events to senior decision makers and supports NDU educational programs in the fields of international security and defense policy. Through an active outreach program, including conferences, international exchanges, and publications, the Institute seeks to promote wider understanding of emerging international security challenges and defense policy options.

Established by the Secretary of Defense in 1984, INSS is comprised of the following components: the Research Directorate, which analyzes global and regional security trends and frames national security policy and defense strategy options for senior decision-makers; the Center for Applied Strategic Learning; and the Conference Directorate, which annually organizes several major symposia and supports more than 100 other conferences, seminars, and roundtables organized by the research staff. The Director of INSS serves concurrently as NDU Vice President for Research.

The **Center for Applied Strategic Learning (CASL or the Center)** designs, develops, and conducts strategic-level games and exercises to provide experiential learning in support of the teaching objectives of the National Defense University. Under the direction of INSS, CASL works on issues of national security policy and strategy development and analysis and provides state-of-the-art political-military games for the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), the Joint Staff, and the Combatant Commands of the Department of Defense.

The Center also conducts crisis decision exercises for Congressional leadership. These exercises are designed to give senior government officials insights into the nuances and complexities of policymaking in the current global security environment, illuminate policy and organizational options, and improve dialogue between the executive and legislative branches of the Federal government on critical national security issues. The Center also conducts an extensive outreach program to numerous colleges, universities, and educational programs.

## INTRODUCTION AND NON-ATTRIBUTION STATEMENT

1. This exercise is a strategic policy seminar game developed by the Center for Applied Strategic Learning. The game is designed to expose participants to the process of making strategic national security decisions. Participants will need to consider a multitude of factors, including diplomatic, informational, international and domestic security, and economic considerations, in crafting their recommendations.
2. The scenario and updates are hypothetical and intended solely to stimulate thought and discussion. They do NOT represent the views of the Department of Defense or the National Defense University. Any use of these materials outside of the context of this game is NOT authorized. Any release, quotation or extraction for publication is strictly prohibited without the prior written permission of the President, National Defense University.
3. This seminar game is being conducted under National Defense University's strict policy of non-attribution. This policy is enforced to ensure that you may freely express your opinions and to encourage the opinions of others. You may not therefore, in any future discussion or correspondence, attribute or associate any of your observations to any of the participants, their schools, or organizations.

## DEFINITIONS

For the purposes of this strategic game, the following definitions, developed by National War College professor Dr. Terry Deibel to integrate currently-used terminology with the language of classic strategic studies, will serve to guide your discussions.

### *STRATEGY*

Strategy is the relationship in thought and action between ends and means, interests and power. More specifically, it is the application of resources to achieve objectives. Writ large, it must include: a statement of assumptions about the international and domestic environment in which it operates; a concept of interests, along with the threats to them and opportunities for their pursuit; an understanding of available resources or power and the influence it provides; and a careful specification of objectives, the instruments to be used for pursuing those objectives, and the ways these instruments are to be used. Writ small, it is a course or courses of action that specifies ends, ways, and means. It is an input to the policy process, a blueprint of what the strategist would like policy to be.

### *POLICY*

Policy in any area is simply the statements and actions of government, the output of the policy process. Both policy and strategy can be conceived of as existing on many different levels: national (including all the ends and means of the nation both at home and abroad); national security (limited to those objectives and resources that protect the nation's interest in security, traditionally against threats from overseas); and military (dealing only with the military tool of

## FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

statecraft). On any level, strategy precedes and should inform the determination of policy on that level, but policy at any level sets the conditions for strategy on levels below it.

### *NATIONAL INTERESTS*

Interests answer the question of “why are we doing this?” They are the standard against which one begins to measure the desirability of objectives. Based ultimately on values, interests are end-states, pictures of a hoped-for reality, the strategist’s wish list, basically everything the state wants or needs. Interests fall into four categories:

- Security of people, property, the homeland
- Prosperity: economic and material well-being
- Value Preservation of our way of life, the political system, and national autonomy or freedom of action
- Value Projection of applying moral considerations overseas

Interests can be ranked as vital, important, or secondary/peripheral according to some combination of their intrinsic value, the degree to which they are satisfied, the threats to which they are vulnerable, or opportunities available for accomplishing them.

### *OBJECTIVES*

Objectives are the subset of the national interest that the nation-state has the power to do something about—to protect or advance—at reasonable cost and risk. They are more specific than interests and justified by serving interests. If interests are nouns, objectives need verbs. They set goals for action and (unlike interests) must take into account the power available for their pursuit, both to ensure their feasibility and that they are desirable in the sense of being worth their cost.

## GAME CONCEPT

1. *PURPOSE*: Provide a forum for civilian and military undergraduate students to better understand and appreciate civil-military cooperation within the context of interagency discussions.

2. *OBJECTIVES*

- A. Break down preconceptions of civilian and military roles and attitudes among participants, through their mutual effort under semi-stressful conditions
- B. Expose participants to interagency planning structures and/or methodologies

3. *ROLES*

- A. Prior to the game, participants will be assigned to a U.S. agency team to role play. No more than six participants will be selected to represent each agency involved in the game. During game play, participants will represent the concerns, equities, and responsibilities

## FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

of their respective agencies. It is important for participants to review their agency role descriptions prior to the game.

- B. Participants will role play a representative team from their respective agencies. They are not Cabinet level officials but will carry great weight with their respective “higher ups.” They should consider themselves a special task force made up of Assistant Secretary level officials that are part of the Interagency Policy Committee (IPC) level of the National Security Council (NSC). The IPC will provide input into the Deputies Committee level of the NSC.
- C. Participants will be divided into various teams (red, white, blue). Each Team consists of a set of all agencies. Each “world” represents a wholly different reality. Decisions made in one world will not impact any other world.

### 4. METHODOLOGY

- A. Participants will be presented with a baseline scenario to kick off the game. The scenario will represent the “game world.” This scenario will outline what the world will look like for game purposes.
- B. Participants will be assigned a role that represents a key U.S. government organization. The participants are expected to role play that assignment within the boundaries as described in the scenario. As a general rule, **do not fight the scenario**. There are artificialities in the scenario for a purpose. If discussions stray outside of specific guidance, the participant is expected to act in accordance with the general principles and spirit of that government organization.
- C. First, each world will hold separate agency meetings. Each agency team will:
  - Prioritize and identify top one or two crises that requires Presidential attention;
  - Develop your agency’s policy options to address top priorities.
- D. Participants will then hold interagency meetings (one for each world). Participants will do the following:
  - Brief your department’s top priority crisis and rationale as to why it demands presidential action. Do not brief recommended policy options.
  - As a group, come to consensus as to which crisis demands immediate presidential action.
  - As a group, develop policy options for the President to address the crisis.
- E. Participants will then receive the Move 2 scenario and return to their respective agency teams. Each agency team will:
  - Prioritize and identify top one or two crises that requires Presidential attention;
  - Develop your agency’s policy options to address top priorities.

## FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

F. Participants will then meet in a second interagency meeting and do the following:

- Brief your department's top priority crisis and rationale as to why it demands presidential action. Do not brief recommended policy options.
- As a group, come to consensus as to which crisis demands immediate presidential action.
- As a group, develop policy options for the President to address the crisis.

G. After the second interagency meeting, participants will regroup into a plenary session. Representatives from each team will brief out the recommended policy options.

### **RULES OF ENGAGEMENT**

1. Don't "fight" or debate the realism of the scenario. Although the scenario is based on the real world, it is HYPOTHETICAL. Real events are intentionally manipulated to create a situation that supports the learning objectives. Take the facts in the scenario at face value and develop your courses of action accordingly.
2. Use your time wisely. Don't get bogged down in procedures and mechanics. By design, a strategic national security game involves limited time for making decisions and incomplete and ambiguous information on which to base actions (not unlike the "real world").
3. Apply all of your knowledge and experience. The game can be only as rich as you make it. You owe it to yourself, and to your colleagues, to bring to bear all of your skills, experiences, creativity, and good judgment. You have nothing to lose and everything to gain.



FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

**SCHEDULE**

0845 – 0900 Arrive in plenary session  
0900 – 0915 Introductory briefing, Move 1 scenario and tasking presentation  
0915 – 0930 Movement to agency groups  
0930 – 1015 Agency discussions  
1015 – 1030 Break / Movement to interagency team groups  
1030 – 1130 Interagency team discussions  
1130 – 1145 Distribute Move 2 NSC Backgrounder  
1145 – 1300 Lunch  
1300 – 1315 Muster in plenary session  
1315 – 1330 Move 2 scenario and tasking presentation  
1330 – 1345 Movement to agency groups  
1345 – 1430 Agency discussions  
1430 – 1445 Break / Movement to interagency team groups  
1445 – 1545 Interagency team discussions  
1545 – 1600 Break / Movement to plenary discussion  
1600 – 1730 Brief out Move 1 and Move 2 recommendations / Hot wash discussion

## NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL STAFF BACKGROUNDER

30 October 2011

### **Iran is likely to test nuclear weapons soon. Israel asks the U.S. not to interfere in possible air strike.**

The U.S. Intelligence Community (IC) has concluded that Iran will conduct a nuclear weapons test shortly. This conclusion is based on Iranian activity over the past week at suspected nuclear weapons facilities. One likely date for the test is November 4<sup>th</sup>, which is when Iranian students took over the U.S. Embassy in Tehran. This morning, the Israeli Foreign Minister informally requested for “non-interference” in the event that their leadership orders an air strike on Iranian nuclear facilities.

The conclusions of the IC are based on highly reliable intelligence sources and national technical means that belong to the U.S. and an allied intelligence service. The consensus within the IC is that Iranian activities point to an inevitable nuclear weapons test in the Kavir-Lut desert region, between Tehran and Afghanistan. Satellite imagery has detected increased numbers of military vehicles transporting materials to the suspected test site. Security has been augmented dramatically to include an additional Russian-made (NATO code SA-15 Gauntlet) TOR-M1 short range surface-to-air air defense battery at the test site and at the Bushehr, Arak, and Isfahan facilities. This system was specifically acquired in 2005 for point defense around nuclear sites. An additional 2 batteries have been deployed around the critical, partially-underground Natanz and Qom uranium enrichment facilities. Iranian naval activity has also increased significantly around the Straits of Hormuz.

Such a test would almost certainly be conducted underground, for purposes of containment and concealment. Previously acquired intelligence indicated longstanding plans for a 400-meter tunnel through which to detonate a device underground. The test control team would be staged over six miles from the tunnel site. Following the test, Iran could plausibly blame any seismic activity caused by a detonation on the desert’s usual tremors.

An Israeli air strike could not guarantee the complete destruction of Iran’s nuclear program. While military action would likely set the program back significantly, it would also likely guarantee that Iranian nationalists would resume the program with even greater commitment. Analysts conclude that the optimal route for Israeli aircraft, both going and returning, would be along Syria’s border with Turkey, then a short flight over Iraq, and into Iran. Nevertheless, the logistics of refueling and reaching the targets undetected involve high complexity and risk, with no assurances of overall success, even should the aircraft reach Iran.

Arab states allied to the U.S. are not expected to condone an Israeli attack on Iran. Regional powers such as Saudi Arabia will likely become more interested in developing nuclear weapons themselves should a strike on Iran fuel Iranian fears for survival, and further regional instability.



Key Iranian nuclear facilities and likely targets of an Israeli air strike.

**Blackout in northeastern U.S. continues on third day. Cause may not be accidental.**

The United States' northeast region is experiencing one of the worst blackouts in American history as government officials are working to mitigate the damages. In the past three days, the blackout has affected at least 30 million people, and caused at least \$10 billion of economic damages.

Landline phone systems are operational in most areas, but the increased call volume has stressed overall call capacity. Cell phones are also being hampered by intermittent power.

Airports throughout the affected states have suffered serious disruptions with delays and cancellations being felt all the way to San Francisco. There have been minimal operations at airports in the blackout area due to reliance on emergency power.

Officials are working to fix public transportation system failures. During the initial days of the black out, thousands of subway passengers in New York City were evacuated as approximately 700 trains stopped operating. Traffic lights throughout the city ceased to function. Car drivers are having problems finding gas stations with emergency generators that can power the gas pumps. This has only exacerbated problems with the unreliable public transportation system.

For people with medical problems, the blackout has added another layer of anxiety. Hospitals are only admitting emergency care patients. Non-emergency care procedures are being delayed or canceled as many hospitals run on backup generators. Health officials are becoming increasingly concerned how this may impact the upcoming flu season, particularly with the most recent H1N1 virus outbreak.

## FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

Schools and major gatherings, including sporting events, have also been cancelled until further notice.

The Governor of New York has issued an emergency declaration in the wake of the blackout. The Governor of New York has requested federal assistance to help out in the immediate response efforts. Police officials in New York City said they first responded as if the power failure had been the work of terrorists, and with the concern that the city was suddenly vulnerable. Heavily armed officers were sent to likely targets. Emergency command centers are in continuous operation in every borough. For many New York City residents, the effects of a blackout of this magnitude are reminiscent of 9-11.

There have been a few incidents of looting in Philadelphia, New Haven, and Trenton. The Governors of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania have called their National Guard units to support local response efforts.

The Department of Homeland Security is coordinating response efforts between the private and public sectors through the Critical Infrastructure Protection and Emergency Management and Response – Information Sharing and Analysis Center (EMR-ISAC). The Secretary is focusing efforts on working with the power, telecommunications, transportations systems, and emergency services sectors to ensure the safety of critical infrastructures. In addition, DHS' Computer Emergency Readiness Team (CERT) is providing response support and defense against cyber attacks for the Federal Civil Executive Branch. CERT is also sharing information and collaborating with state and local government, industry and international partners. Federal officials from the Department of Homeland Security, Department of Energy, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation are investigating the cause of the blackout. Initial analysis of the incident indicates that this may not be an accident. The intelligence community is working with utility companies to investigate the exact cause of the blackout.

### **Lithuanian nuclear power plant experiencing meltdown. Six thousand Americans may require assistance.**

At 0300 hours EST on 30 October, the Secretary of State received an urgent report from the U.S. Ambassador in Lithuania. The ambassador reported that the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant in Visaginas, Lithuania, has experienced a massive meltdown. Visaginas is in eastern Lithuania, close to the borders of Belarus and Latvia. Dangerous amounts of radioactive material have been released into the atmosphere as a result of the explosion of the reactor. The U.S. Embassy has issued a warden alert to all U.S. citizens and tourists notifying them of the disaster. They are being told to evacuate the immediate area in an upwind direction from the reactor. Those outside of the immediate danger zone are told to protect in place until further notice. The U.S. embassy estimates that there are at least 6,000 tourists and expatriates with U.S. or dual U.S. citizenship currently in Lithuania.

Annually, approximately 30,000 U.S. citizens travel to Lithuania. Additionally, 240,000 total tourists arrived from Estonia and Latvia in 2008, along with 200,000 from Russia and Belarus each.

## FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

The Lithuanian government has ordered the immediate evacuation of Visaginas and all areas within a 30 mile radius. Emergency responders from the Radiation Protection Centre and other Defense Ministry components have begun containment procedures. Incoming international flights have been canceled and travel into or through the eastern part of the country is temporarily halted. The Lithuanian Foreign Minister has asked for immediate foreign medical and consequence management assistance to handle humanitarian needs and radioactive clean up requirements.

The Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant design is similar to the Chernobyl Nuclear Power Plant that was destroyed in 1987. Based on that prior disaster, Department of Energy experts estimate that dozens will die immediately and potentially hundreds of thousands more will be exposed to dangerous levels of radiation. The Chernobyl disaster caused approximately 56 immediate and 4,000 long-term deaths, with hundreds of thousands of other residents and emergency workers exposed to radiation over the years. The Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant had one remaining nuclear reactor at the time of the incident, the other having been shut down to satisfy European Union standards for membership. The remaining reactor had been scheduled for shut down, as well. The Ignalina Plant generated almost 70% of Lithuania's electricity, with original nuclear fuel imported from Russia. Both this plant and Chernobyl featured the Soviet-designed RBMK reactor, both of which lack a containment structure.

Department of Energy experts are concerned that the radiation plume may cross international borders. This is precisely what happened in 1987, when the Chernobyl explosion released 400 times the amount of fallout produced in the nuclear bombing Hiroshima.

### **Major hurricane expected to hit Honduras in two days. Honduran government expects major damage and requests aid and assistance.**

The U.S. National Hurricane Center has warned that Hurricane Maria could be a record-breaking Category 5 storm that will hit Honduras. The Honduran government is preparing for Maria to make landfall within the next two days and is requesting foreign assistance to mitigate the imminent damages. Honduran officials are concerned that they do not have adequate resources to deal with this significant natural disaster and humanitarian crisis.

U.S. government agencies are currently preparing to assist Honduras, if approved by the President. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)'s Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) is preparing to purchase and deliver emergency relief supplies (plastic sheeting, blankets, hygiene kits, water containers, etc) to Honduras as well as provide funds to cooperating non-profit organizations. The Department of Defense is reviewing plans and staging resources in collaboration with the Department of State. Southern Command (SOUTHCOM) and Northern Command (NORTHCOM) are monitoring the situation to assist with disaster response plans and assess the possible types of forces needed. The United States Coast Guard is also preparing for search and rescue operations.

The international community is also working to assist in response efforts. Numerous United Nations organizations, including the United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), the United Nations Children Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations High Commissioner for

## FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

Refugees (UNHCR), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the World Health Organization (WHO), are promoting individual preparedness strategies and providing assistance to Honduras as well as to key international aid organizations. For example, UNICEF is collecting life-saving supplies, including medical kits, blankets and hygiene kits to prevent waterborne diseases that are too easily spread in the aftermath of emergencies. In addition, the Organization of American States (OAS) encouraged its member states and the international community to provide assistance to Honduras.

Honduras is extremely apprehensive of the imminent disaster. In 1998, Hurricane Mitch destroyed fifty years of progress in the country and severely affected El Salvador, Guatemala, Belize, and Nicaragua. Hurricane Mitch left approximately 11,000 people dead as a result of mudslides and floods. UNICEF estimates that three million people were left homeless or severely affected by the natural disaster. Severe crop shortages also left villagers on the brink of starvation, while lack of sanitation led to outbreaks of malaria, dengue fever, and cholera. In addition, this posed an even greater nutrition and sanitary concern for pregnant women and children.

The floods and mudslides from Hurricane Mitch severely damaged the infrastructure of Honduras. An estimated 70-80% of the transportation infrastructure was destroyed by Hurricane Mitch, wiping out mostly bridges and secondary roads. Over 25 villages washed away, airports were under water, and one third of the buildings in Tegucigalpa were damaged by the floods. Helicopters were required to deliver supplies to areas cut off by floods. Hurricane Mitch caused severe crop losses, destroying more than 29% of Honduras' arable land. About 70% of crops were destroyed, an estimated loss of \$900 million.

The international community provided assistance of up to \$6.3 billion.

The United States and Honduras have a strategic partnership and history of solid bilateral and interagency cooperation. Both nations have been collaborating to effectively combat illicit drug, arms, and human trafficking in Latin America. For example, the Honduran military has joined the United States and other regional partners to exercise maritime security operations, peacekeeping, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, medical readiness and other critical capabilities. Honduras has sent a contingent of 370 troops in support of U.S. operations in Iraq. The U.S. also provides aircraft, boats, and equipment to Honduras to enhance their drug-interdiction capabilities.

U.S. Southern Command's only permanently deployed U.S. forces in the region is Joint Task Force – Bravo (JTF-BRAVO) at Soto Cano Air Base in Honduras. JTF-BRAVO's primary mission is to support and conduct joint, combined and interagency operations in the Joint Operations Area, to enhance regional cooperative security initiatives and to support democratic development. It also works to provide command and control, administrative, and logistical support for exercises, deployments, and humanitarian and civic assistance projects conducted in the Republic of Honduras. JTF-BRAVO is comprised of U.S. military and civilian personnel and Honduran civilians which includes a Medical Element and the 1<sup>st</sup> Battalion, 228<sup>th</sup> Aviation Regiment.

**A North Korean cargo ship may be delivering missile or nuclear weapons related material. Ship is being tracked by U.S. Navy.**

Yesterday, U.S. intelligence sources sighted a North Korean cargo vessel suspected of carrying ballistic missile and possibly nuclear-related materials. It is currently in the South China Sea and is believed to be on course for Iran. Latest intelligence places the freighter in international waters west of Manila, Philippines. The vessel is currently being shadowed by the missile destroyer, USS John McCain. This could be the latest instance in a long history of North Korean weapons proliferation to other rogue states. While the supposed cooperation between North Korea and Iran has to date only involved missiles and conventional weapons, their close relationship does not rule out the sharing of nuclear technology. The freighter will reach either the Strait of Malacca or the Strait of Lombok within 48 hours. Once it crosses into the Indian Ocean, estimates are 15 to 20 days before it reaches Iran.

North Korea has been the world's chief exporter of missiles and missile technology, and Iran has been one of its chief clients. Iran and North Korea have been sharing missile technology for at least 20 years. Iran's February 2009 launch of an artificial satellite is testament to the progress made. Both countries' development towards missiles with nuclear warheads is also a major concern.

The Pentagon has officially confirmed that North Korea and Iran have cooperated on missile developments for decades. The possibility of nuclear cooperation cannot be ruled out. Future Iranian "Shahab" missile variants may be based on the North Korean Taepodong missile. The 3-stage version of the Taepodong-2C could strike targets up to approximately 15,000 kilometers, reaching the continental United States when launched from either Iran or North Korea.



FOR EXERCISE PURPOSES ONLY

There is speculation that North Korea may transfer some of its missile development activities to Iran in order to circumvent U.N. resolutions that prohibit North Korea from missile testing. North Korea has defied U.N. restrictions on numerous occasions. Missile and nuclear tests by North Korea in May 2009 prompted the United Nations to authorize the inspection of vessels suspected of carrying nuclear or missile proliferation materials to or from North Korea. North Korea responded with a declaration that it would consider any such intercepts as an act of war. Despite the declaration, in August 2009, United Arab Emirates authorities seized a vessel smuggling small-arms from North Korea to Iran.