

WIRE PAPER

POINTS FOR DISCUSSION

A. TRAINING

1. What have we learned from previous winners who have done well? What sort of approach did they employ that may have been relevant for success?
2. Perhaps we should make a clear definition of "needs" (i.e., what type of applications should we pursue, and in what priority?). Our requirements may in fact specify what type of training (or training modification) are appropriate. Conversely, we should critically examine currently available training procedure and evaluate them relative to what they can be expected to do, what type of applications can they solve? What are their application limits? (See attached chart on "RV applications" for reference to possible RV problem-sets).  
Perhaps a matrix like the following could be developed:

PROBLEM SET	TRAINING METHOD			
	A	B	C	...
A <sub>1</sub>	+ 0 -	-		?
B <sub>1</sub>	-	-		

3. What are all relevant issues that need to be considered for viewer selection?
- Viewer Background (associated to problem set?)
  - Psychological profile (type of visual, stability, etc)
  - Personal preferences (associated to problem set?)
  - other (IQ, targeting, preferences, physical state of health, ...)
30. IS THE TRAINING PROGRAM Per Se, a single metric, that is important? (What is it used for training for?)
4. Define anticipated training pace, and other particulars (i.e., session time, estimated number of sessions per stage, related activities such as drawing, sketching). How do we know when training is "complete"? How are training sessions evaluated? Does the current training approach limit application to a 'CRV' targeting speed?
5. There is a pressing need to define "operational readiness" criteria. (both individual and unit). This must relate to priority of problem sets, problem set viewers 'qualify' for, degree of reliability/accuracy, ... and various other issues (TRAINING procedure, person background, ...). This needs to be related to targeting methods, and possibly other factors.
6. Related to item 5, is a pressing need to define how the transition from "Training (whatever method)" to "operations" can occur? Is this instantaneous? How do training programs now available harden into the operational world? or do they not do this at all? If so, how are we going to fill that gap, or "operationally qualify" viewers? We need a "program, procedure, set of criteria, problem sets etc specifically for this.

7. Some possible operational qualifiers:

(1) "add-on" to training, <sup>phase</sup> various types of operational, or "simulated operational" problems, possibly increasing such task as training progresses. (or possibly, wait until after "formal" training ends).

(2) Suggested "operational qualifying" protocols:

- a. OPS - A . the real McCoy ... Targets of opportunity .. can be anything .. May be QRT or long term. Basic data of interest is unknown, <sup>other</sup> aspects may be known.
- b. OPS - B . Simulated problems . For pre-ops calibration. Examples include various foreign matter sets (possibly from maps, latest photos, other ..). The data is basically known (but not known by interviewee), or can be readily found.
- c. OPS - C . Simulated <sup>other</sup> problems . a variety of "other" problems can be examined if these matter sets relate to <sup>relevant</sup> intelligence applications. Examples include:

C-1 : State of health (of <sup>foreign</sup> individuals)

C-2 : Police case work (limited trials regarding high interest police case work where resolution may be near at hand. There would be "concocting"; is not made part of anything other than in-house records for evaluation purposes. (i.e. not worked with police.)

C-3: Proccognition: can be anything. Examples include "predicting the next terrorist strike"; the next <sup>major</sup> airplane accident, next major natural disaster (where & when)... <sup>such</sup> "practice" may improve reliability on certain "CPS-A" problems.

C-4 ~~can~~ Said/Trick a variety of location problems can be worked... in local area... or with known travelers.

(3) above problem sets would learn have a variety of targeting methods (not only those employed in training)

(4) <sup>complete</sup> ~~careful~~ records, evaluation procedure, <sup>etc</sup> are required for these problems/tasks.

(5) all data from about above "problems" must be kept from the interviewee... the interviewee only knows the questions... Others (specific individual) provide feedback & evaluation when known (or partially known).

8. Interviewer: we need a bad- of interviewee row, what if fed in such, a TOY?

9. TRAINING SESSION EVALUATION: Need a 2nd (or 2nd + 3rd) party evaluator: Interviewer recommended -- one & other provide final evaluations. For all training sessions. C.I.T. of ASAP!

BASIC DATA CATEGORIES

PT'S THAT APPLY (of 36 MAIN CATEGORIES) (36)

- 1. PRESENCE / ABSENCE 8
- 2. LOCATION / DEPLOYMENT 20
- 3. UNIT / FORCE STRUCTURE, COMPOSITION 4
- 4. TEST / PROGRAM / FACILITY STATUS (~~CURRENT, PROJECTED~~) 12
- 5. FUNCTION NATURE 12
- 6. CONFIGURATION (SIZE / CONTENTS) 10
- 7. TECHNOLOGY / SYSTEM CAPABILITIES 15

CURRENT, NEW / PROJECTED / TIMING  
 ANOMALIES, LIMITATIONS / DEFECTS, FAILURES

- 8. PEOPLE 4
  - DESCRIPTIONS / IDENTITY / ASSOCIATIONS
  - MEDICAL ASPECTS (STATE OF HEALTH, DISEASE)

- 10. { Predictive intel
- 10. { PREDICTIVE (ALL OF ABOVE) -HARD ALL

• TIP-OFF / CURING, CHANGES, NEW ACTIVITY  
 • PLANS / INTENTIONS

- 11. FOREIGN SECURITY DATA (CORES...) (?)
- (12) NARRATING DOWN POSSIBILITIES ALL