

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT LYING ON CRISIS WITHIN US INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY

Andrei ZOTA, Marian OANĂ

Ministry of National Defense, Romania (andrei.zota@shape.nato.int,
marian.oana@gamil.com)

DOI: 10.19062/2247-3173.2016.18.2.29

Abstract: *The most respected source for surviving in crisis management is Information. Nevertheless, information sharing represents, for the Intelligence Community, the act of exchanging intelligence between collectors, analysts and users in order to improve security. This is seen inside as essential rather than a courtesy. Efforts are directed to act according a mind-set in intelligence - the responsibility to provide instead, of the former practice of need to know. For now, more than a few challenges face information exchange in crisis management.*

The main idea is to foster a culture of information sharing, all levels of government, the private sector and foreign partners. Within the Intelligence Community this process is "at the end of the beginning" - a beginning has been made but much work remains to be done.

Keywords: *information exchange, intelligence sharing, cooperation, crises management, intelligence management, security*

1. INTRODUCTION

Exchange of information - formula based response to threats and intelligence reform.

Recent developments in the security field, the activated or latent conflicts from claiming a significant share require more difficult decisions to be taken by state actors alone or in an alliance.

The security environment is marked by deep changes lately in the main areas of social existence: NATO and the EU expanded eastwards towards the Black Sea, Caucasus and Near East (between the Baltic and Black Sea), the EU accede to the status global player, the rivalry with the US and the Russian Federation has rekindled political and military influence, especially by the Ukrainian crisis.

Globalization security environment amid various actions and ambitions manifested world or regional actors, highlights the genesis of asymmetric and unconventional threats, which in turn determines equally risks for world states.

In this context, the exchange of information becomes a powerful support to develop action in one direction or another, to support a decision within a system of alliances in order to prevent harmful interventions of external actors opponents.

Current security threats combined formulas response calls. In the field of information exchange this report cause - effect can be summed up thus: the new challenges and threats, whatever their nature (environmental, physical or virtual), require that security actions by intelligence, is that of a complex network information curable, disposing of proactive and reactive sources of information, with a accelerated flow and a high degree of accuracy. In order to keep up with the pace of change and threats it must accelerate these types of actions within the intelligence community.

Today, technology can influence, direct and rapidly changing future, so that unhindered access to information, sharing of personal information massive - from the individual or business - corporate environment is realized today through the Internet. The Internet has the ability to facilitate the connection, communication and sharing of information; through the use of technology at different levels of development, without any computers, applications or identical security level can access information in a uniform manner.

Thus, in the intelligence community collaboration and cooperation is necessary to improve inter-departmental and inter-agency; relying on the information technology industry, policymakers must find and implement a workaround Internet, the only difference being that the network should be secured and interconnection policies strictly controlled.

Exchange of information mean more than technology and culture is based on responsibility to provide information in Intelligence, in many cases the two concepts substituting one another. In the US Intelligence Community, information exchange can be defined as the act of exchanging information between intelligence collectors, analysts and policy makers in order to strengthen national security.

Efforts recent years is characterized by trying to adopt the exchange of information not only as a complex technology, but as a rule of conduct for the exchange of information and the objective of establishing a trusted partnership for the exchange of information between all available information and ensuring that those who need the security of information you receive in a timely. Promoting the exchange of information was accelerated after 9/11 events.

The exchange of information was one of the key recommendations of the 9/11 Commission, subsequently turning the cornerstone of American strategy for intelligence reform. 9/11 Commission Report issued conclude that the necessary information about the attacks there, but they were not available to those who needed them, largely due to the "wall" created in the exchange of information between law enforcement institutions (in this case CIA FBI). The report raises the question of necessity for new procedures concerning the exchange of information and a widening technological advancement and exchange framework.

The report clearly highlight the state of the US Intelligence Community: it was created during the Cold War, when information was limited, restrictive trade flow and enemies were moving at a pace slow and easy enough to predict; The situation is totally different, contrasting fast evolving threats demanding answers as: fast, imaginative and agile. To develop such capabilities, the information must change into a much larger framework and be freed from the standard need to know that proves to be exceeded, the actual principle of the need to share information.

Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Commission report 2005 - Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding WMD, makes a number of recommendations on information sharing.

Overall, the Commission recommended establishment of an information exchange unit and standardization of practices, procedures and rules for US citizens access to information and simplifying procedures for classification.

2. COLLECTION AND DECISION PROCESS IN CRISIS MANAGEMENT - A NEW APPROACH TO INFORMATION EXCHANGE

In 2008, the US was drawn first strategy information sharing among the intelligence community in order to improve the ability of intelligence professionals to exchange

information to strengthen US national security; document formulated broadly, how to remove institutional barriers and technical, so the federal government could be in a position to take decisions of vital importance to national security.

US intelligence community is involved in an extremely complex associating two major processes: risk management and improve the exchange of information; also we must not lose sight of issues such as achieving a fair balance between benefits and costs - calculated in advance, ensuring the success of missions, civil liberties and the protection of sources and methods.

This offers a new vision of sharing information, exposing a model for implementing that vision through the Community Information interconnections between exchanging information, making a thorough knowledge and enhanced security.

Information exchange is influenced by some challenges, which makes it difficult for entities to proceed successfully in decision-making, some of them being summarized here:

- Crisis are diverse and unbreakable to forecast.
- Information may vary and modify in a timely manner.
- Different information types and sources
- Missing awareness about information demands
- Dealing with information doubts
- Redundancy
- Policy/Procedure issues.

The new model is totally opposed to sharing information the exchange of information from before 9/11 events and includes:

- adopting of a dominant exchange of information to characterize the entities involved and be based on responsibility to provide the information necessary (need to share versus need to know);
- position in which agencies must act is that of belonging to a complex institutional expanded the type of enterprise and information exchange to proceed accordingly in this larger context: between agencies with different partners and across international borders ;
- type of collaboration needed is dynamic, based on a rapid adaptation to the needs which are constantly changing and the inclusion of new partners in the exchange of information;
- security is built into the database, and access to focus on attributes that go beyond classification levels - focusing on missions, environment and affiliation;
- giving up ownership of information, facilitating information exchange to remove barriers "culture" and to further the analysis (intelligence) which use multidimensional security protocols to follow appropriate.

The strategy specifies the main key points, goals and objectives envisaged in the development process of information sharing between all partners involved in the community and among allies. The objectives identified in the Strategy explicitly described the actions to be implemented, are considered a bridge between the current state in which the exchange of information and the targets set in its implementation in the future.

Moreover, the complexity of effective implementation of the special high information exchange and areas is reflected in the smooth functioning of the process involved: government, politics, technology, culture and economics.

Subsequently, this strategy was seen as a new form of organization for intelligence, a mix of policies, procedures and technology for the exchange of information between all entities entitled, at the local, state and federal external partners and the private sector.

In the current major objectives within the Intelligence Community to the United States remain: creating a culture of information sharing, reduce barriers to facilitate the exchange of information, improving practices exchange internally and with external partners, institutionalized exchange information.

3. CONCLUSION

Assessments on the effectiveness of promoting the exchange of information throughout American community does not have a unified position; US Department of Justice concluded that law enforcement agencies are fully satisfied in the exchange of information on terrorism held. On the other hand, all those law enforcement agencies in the US who do not have operational units, expressing their dissatisfaction.

Assessments on the operations centers fusion of information, however, are negative: many of their representatives complain that, although centers merger they run receive sufficient information from federal agencies, it appears that these centers do not get "never" correct information necessary, or is received in an inefficient manner. Leaders fusion centers consider that most times the appropriate targeting intelligence threats should be called fusion centers more than being proactive federal agencies in providing this type of information. A difficulty found is that members manifested fusion centers manifest inability to request such information.

Other assessments point out flaws at the level of personnel training in the sense of lack of control over it; He insists on the idea that change should occur and how people perform their activities and the need to establish a system of rewards and sanctions and awareness and accountability for information exchange to be built by programs go through documentation.

Thus, it can be said that exchange information is crucial in the current security environment, eroded and attacked new challenges, risks and asymmetric threats. Instead, the danger for such information fusion center may come with sharing information unreal, based only on the interests of a single actor, usually the issuer.

This practice has shown that the information war has become permanent, multidisciplinary and dual. Permanence refers to the strategy of an actor collection, protection, management and limiting access to others / opponent to information and outside of conflict or crisis periods.

Multidisciplinary refers to the interconnection of systems, organizations, objectives, views, ways and measures used to achieve them. Duality refers to the fact that disappeared differences between the military and civilian, to the fact that the means of retaliatory violence are not strict monopoly of armed forces, being caught up and sometimes overrun by violence information that statewide facilitated migration to banking, financial, energy, communication, distribution of resources and infrastructure.

About the benefits of institutionalizing the exchange of information estimates are generally characterized by formulations in the future; while the world is moving towards service-oriented system, everything is subject to change, generating new areas of action; It is expected to further increase the opportunities to develop services that will allow rapid exchange of information so that the parties are entitled to correct information in an optimal timeframe.

Regarding the need to enhance cooperation and exchange of information between national intelligence agencies in the context of escalating regional conflicts, progress is in an early stage; It requires states to produce intelligence - and this depends on their individual commitments - for their turn to receive intelligence.

An example taken into account in NATO is the exchange of information developed by the US that have the most extensive system of intelligence in the world and the exchange

of information with Britain, which facilitates in some cases the information transfer terrorism coming from US to Europe.

Implementation exchange of information on different levels in the European Union can be a contributing factor blurring the differences between consumers and producers of security transition to status holders / guarantors of global security.

The exchange of information will become the expression enhancing the products of intelligence, in terms of quality of activities in systems / organizations charged with the management of security in relation to the efforts of collection, storage, processing, analysis, information processing, so as to be able to draw relevant conclusions and information products, to be made available to decision makers and responsible for implementing various policies in order to develop response options / riposte risks and threats identified.

Efficiency measures to ensure regional security awareness, prevention and counteraction of any kind of threat, will be directly proportional to the value and performance of information submitted by beneficiaries. Efficient management of security issues will have to develop an effective operational management of landing intelligence activities and enhancing exchanges of information.

Cooperation by exchanging information is based primarily common interests in clarifying a situation, but given the way the laws of each state allows this type of joint action. The lack of legislative harmonization at Community level is currently an impediment to counter potential risks and threats. Therefore, legislative harmonization is important to be satisfied, other measures arising as a direct and natural.

Information is an significant thing when making the proper decisions and therefore for the achievement of the entire operation. In this study we tried to analyze crisis management practices within the US Intelligence Community, and pointed out some challenges in sharing information between different organizations.

Thus, it can be said drawing conclusions for a work in full swing turns out to be difficult; therefore I consider that the evaluation / quantification efficiency on the exchange of information at different levels of government, state and local level, can compensate for lack of explicitly formulated conclusions.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Jones Calvert, *Intelligence Reform: The Logic of Information Sharing, Intelligence and National Security*, Vol. 22, 2007, Numarul 3, pag. 384-385.
- [2]. United States Intelligence Community, *Information Sharing Strategy*, 22 Februarie 2008, la www.dni.gov.
- [3]. Jones Calvert, *The 9/11 Commission Report: Final Report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks upon the United States: Official Government Edition*, Washington, 2004, p.399.
- [4]. http://www.fas.org/irp/off_docs/eo/ExecutiveOrders:13311,13356,13388.
- [5]. Raportul Comisiei WDM / 2005 - *Commission on the Intelligence Capabilities of the United States Regarding Weapons of Mass Destruction*.
- [6]. ISE (Information Sharing Environment) - *Progress and Plans, Annual Report to the Congress, Iunie 2009*.
- [7]. Charlotte Adams, *Information Sharing Raises More Questions than Answers. The devil is in details as assets and liabilities are weighed*, 2008, p.82.
- [8]. Bruce Berkowitz and Allan Goodman, *Best Truth: Intelligence in the Information Age*.
- [9]. Gregory TREVERTON, *Reshaping Intelligence for an Age of Information* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2001), p.17.
- [10]. Gregory TREVERTON F., *Reorganizing US Domestic Intelligence, Assessing the Options*, Rand Corporation, 2008, p.36.
- [11]. *The changing face of intelligence* – NATO Advanced Research Workshop, 2005 –2006, Colegiul St. Anthony.

SOCIO – HUMANITIES

- [12]. James Igoe Walsh, *The international politics of Intelligence Sharing*, Columbia University Press, New York, 2010, p. 132, 133.
- [13]. Richard J. Aldrich, *International intelligence cooperation in practice*, Routledge, New York, 2011, p. 18-20.
- [13]. *SHAPE Comprehensive Crisis and Operations Management (CCOM) process Handbook*, December 2014.
- [14]. Roceanu Ion, Vitalis Eduard, Zodian Mihai. *Social media within evolution of political and economical crisis*, Bucharest, National Defense University, „Carol I”, 2014.