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I. Introduction: Background to Defence Reform Processes

Many governments around the world are restructuring their armed forces and associated headquarters at present. The drivers for these reforms include the stark financial situation facing many countries, a situation from which defence is not immune (indeed, defence itself has often been characterised by long-term mismatches between resources and aspirations that have contributed to these situations); the drawdown of forces from enduring operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, which presents an opportunity to reconfigure force structures and postures to cope with anticipated future operational demands and political expectations; growing anxiety with vested interests in individual services, which can hinder the achievement of a coherent force structure and capability; and long-term geostrategic and political trends, of which the most obvious and high-profile response to date has been the Obama administration’s ‘pivot’ to Asia.

The drivers for defence reform differ from country to country. This paper considers two examples: the United Kingdom and India.

The UK is undertaking significant reform primarily as a result of the financial situation the Ministry of Defence found itself in, as demonstrated by the mismatch between resources and aspiration, notably in the Equipment Programme. The government identified that the forward Programme could not have been afforded even if the core defence budget continued to rise at the rate at which it had grown since 1999 (1.1 per cent annually in real terms): there was an unfunded liability of £27 billion within the programme. In addition, as part of its contribution to the UK’s overall deficit reduction plan, the MoD had to reduce its budget by 8.6 per cent in real terms by 2014/15; this reduction in the core budget (below the annual 1.1 per cent growth which, before the financial crisis, it could reasonably have expected based on historical trends) resulted in a further funding gap of £47 billion in the forward Programme. While capability reductions as a result of the 2010 Strategic Defence and Security Review and the subsequent ‘three month exercise’ in 2011 have encouraged the MoD to believe that future capability plans and projected budgets are now broadly in balance, key equipment programmes, notably the Trident renewal, Joint Strike Fighter, and future Type 26 Frigate, are still major sources of potential instability to the defence budget.

1. For an extensive analysis of the defence budgetary situation, see Malcolm Chalmers, ‘Looking into the Black Hole: Is the UK Defence Budget Crisis Really Over?’, RUSI Briefing Paper, September 2011.

2. Ibid.
The Coalition Government believed that this mismatch signified a deeper problem with departmental relationships, leadership, advice and skills. The relationships that had developed between the department’s political leadership, military leadership and civilian officials were certainly damaged as a result of the black hole in the defence budget. They were also damaged by inadequacies (both perceived and real) in force generation, and, importantly, the nature of advice and direction provided in these areas. Subsequent research has also identified problems with advice provided by officers and officials to ministers in respect of deployments in Afghanistan, and with the strategic direction provided by government to the MoD and armed forces for those operations. As a result, an external committee was established to conduct a root and branch review of defence management.

In contrast to the UK, India is not undertaking reforms principally as a result of the financial situation that exists within defence. Rather, the government appointed a committee under Naresh Chandra in July 2011 to revisit a defence reform process which had been stalled for many years. In 1999, the Kargil Review Committee was established to examine the failures that led to the Kargil War between India and Pakistan in 1999. As a result of this report, the government appointed a Group of Ministers to make recommendations for reforming India’s national security institutions. It is notable that the Naresh Chandra Committee was established to examine why implementation of previous defence reform recommendations had been so difficult. If the financial situation facing the UK Ministry of Defence was indicative of deeper problems in departmental relationships, leadership, advice and skills, so the slow pace of reform in India could be taken to indicate similar systemic issues. The Naresh Chandra Committee was also established to reinvigorate the previous defence reform proposals to ensure they position India for the future strategic context and a more assertive role in the world. As Anit Mukherjee has noted:

It is clear that India’s economic rise is forcing it to look beyond its territorial borders to secure its economic interests (particularly vis-à-vis energy), to engage with its diaspora, conduct diplomatic outreach with other states and respond to the changing security landscape. Against the backdrop of declining US power, other nations are also interested in India’s capacity to provide security and perhaps emerge as a counterweight to China. However, for India to emerge as a true global power and to secure its expanding
national interests, it will have to undertake a major exercise in reforming its national security institutions with a particular focus on defence reform. Without such restructuring, the Indian military, an essential component of India’s national power, will continue to be hindered by problems in civil-military relations, inter-services co-operation, defence planning and overall military effectiveness.

A number of commentaries have been written about the defence reform processes in both countries.\(^5\) This paper, which is based on a comparative analysis of the experience of how defence establishments in the UK and India are functioning, and of previous and current attempts at defence reform, is cognisant of the significant differences between the countries – geopolitically, in terms of the threats faced and type of operations undertaken, and the scale of the armed forces in each country – and of the fact that there is no one model for the management of defence. Indeed, those involved in defence reform have noted themselves that they ‘sought to find the right solution for the particular set of challenges faced by defence today; and also to recognise that those challenges will change, and the model therefore needs to be lean and agile such that it can continually improve and adapt to changing circumstances’.\(^6\) Nonetheless, during dialogues between the UK and India on defence reform, a number of common enablers for successful reform and the generation of defence outputs were recognised, and a significant number of opportunities for greater UK-India collaboration and sharing of best practice were identified. This paper explores the following areas:

- Political leadership, including the relationship that is developed between politicians and officials
- Education of civilian officials
- Education of members of the armed forces
- Service and cross-government integration
- The utility of experimentation to help achieve reform, notably by overcoming institutional barriers and vested interests.

This paper benefited from a joint conference held with Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (IDSA) in New Delhi from 30 April to 1 May 2012.

---


II. Political Leadership

Politicians are fundamental to the success of defence reform and output in two respects: because political leadership is necessary to drive organisational change; and because, in democratic countries, politicians are accountable for the state and activities of the armed forces and the organisation that supports them, and are also required to provide strategic direction to the defence establishment.

In India, the role of politicians in defence is certainly not as significant as might be expected. This situation exists for a number of reasons. First, as a result of the 1962 Sino-Indian war, in which alleged political meddling was widely criticised, Indian politicians rarely interfere in what is considered to be the professional domain of the military, which means that each of the services has significant control over most of their internal functions and operational direction, with little oversight. This has become an established norm, and is exacerbated by a second factor: the fact that politicians do not have requisite knowledge or experience of the military prior to being appointed to ministerial (or other relevant oversight) positions, and therefore do not feel able to challenge the military. As a result, there is a lack of political leadership, political ownership of defence and little dialogue between the political class and the armed forces (the defence minister’s committee meetings are irregular). More recently, the nature of the political system and electoral cycle has also distracted attention from issues such as defence and foreign policy, as individual states have assumed greater authority. Coupled with the absence of senior officials or officers to drive forward jointery and integration across defence, reform efforts stagnate given the strength of the single services. In addition, these factors have all contributed to a growing political perception that the democratic credentials of the armed forces are lacking, as perhaps demonstrated by press reports suggesting that the government was concerned about internal army movements in April 2012 which it had not been informed of in advance. The military are in turn unhappy with what they perceive to be their marginalisation from policy-making, which has reinforced mistrust.

The nature of the relationship between the political leadership of the Ministry of Defence and senior officials and officers in the UK is also poor, and, though there is constant dialogue, the view of many is that this dialogue has not been adequate for some time.

The relationship has been damaged over many years as a result of the black hole that existed in the defence budget. The relationship has also been damaged by inadequacies (both perceived and real) in force generation: despite the significant (and ongoing) operational demands of the past decade, and innovations such as the Urgent Operational Requirements
process to allow the rapid introduction of previously unidentified but important assets to theatre, the delivery of capabilities has often been politically contentious in terms of timeliness and cost. Experience has also identified that vital enablers for operational success, such as intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance assets, have not received the prioritisation they deserve through existing planning processes, primarily because they are not championed by any one of the single services. Political frustration and impatience with what are seen to be the vested interests of individual services which have contributed to this poor budgetary and force generation situation, coupled with public lobbying by senior officers, has been high.

Research has also identified problems with advice provided by officers and officials to ministers in respect of deployments in Afghanistan (ministers did not understand the implications of that advice), and with the strategic direction provided by government to the MoD and armed forces for operations. Gaps in the strategic direction and capacity of the department were weaknesses that had been recognised previously in a number of Capability Reviews of the MoD conducted in 2007, 2008 and 2009 by the Cabinet Office.

The response to this situation has not been for the political leadership of the Ministry of Defence to pull back. Rather, reforms following the Levene Report have reaffirmed the central position of ministers in the running of defence: the Defence Board has been reformed to become smaller and politically led, and the creation of the Major Projects Review Board has placed the Secretary of State in a very central position in decision-making related to the long-term Equipment Programme. In terms of operations, there has also been a noticeable trend for greater political interference at the operational and tactical levels, particularly in relation to force protection and tactical targeting decisions. This interference is partly an inevitable outcome of the strategic effect that lower-level decisions can have (particularly where that effect has domestic political implications), but also reflects a lack of confidence in the advice and military options presented to ministers (including the creativity of that advice). This situation is unsustainable, as it divests officers and officials of responsibility for decision-making, and is also not suitable for fast-moving crises or interventions. It also means that, while the Levene Report tried to clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of ministers, civilian officials and the military at the policy, strategic and operational levels, confusion persists.

A further problem with the central role afforded to ministers is that fewer and fewer politicians have any knowledge or experience of defence and the armed forces prior to occupying their positions. In the past, politicians would have had careers before entering Parliament, which often included military service, or members of their families would have been serving; this in turn reflects a broader decline in the awareness of defence, and links to the armed
forces, in the general public. This absence of knowledge and experience means that political leadership and direction could remain lacking.

It follows from these considerations that:

- Political leadership and ownership is required to achieve organisational change. Political leadership can overcome the barriers presented by the different ‘balances of power’ that exist across defence, for example between the individual services.

- The central role political leaders should adopt in the management of defence, particularly in inter-service and intra-service prioritisation and scrutinising command plans, requires ministers to have adequate knowledge and understanding of defence and the armed forces. This knowledge should not be developed on the job only. How to develop greater understanding of defence, particularly in a context where the awareness of and links to the armed forces across the general public are declining substantially, is a significant challenge.

- The UK’s Armed Forces Parliamentary Scheme tries to increase political understanding of defence and the armed forces, though its focus is primarily on providing experience of the operational side rather than issues of defence strategy, policy and planning. The Scheme is an example of best practice which could be adopted by other countries, but should be extended to provide politicians with experience of defence policy-making.

- Some politicians have attended the Royal College of Defence Studies course. The College provides some insight into higher level defence issues, though there are questions about its ability to teach strategy. Access to the College should be easier. In addition, political participation in courses at staff colleges should be explored, as these would give an insight into defence policy and planning, including for actual operations, which could help stem any political mistrust or interference at the tactical and operational levels.

- To reduce political interference at the operational and tactical levels, military and official advice must build in political risk factors.

- Mechanisms for political leaders to engage with officials and officers, such as defence boards and relevant committee meetings, need to be regular and focused. Defence structures must encourage interaction.

- Supporting ministers with a central unit dedicated to defence reform provides focus and a mechanism for driving forward implementation,
even once review committees have reported. Implementation is key and has tended to be forgotten in previous reviews.

- The involvement of external members in the UK’s Defence Reform Unit was vital to overcoming vested interests. Continued oversight of the defence reform process by external experts, including through membership of the Defence Board as non-executives, helps to ensure momentum is maintained, and that the Ministry of Defence and services are held to account and constantly challenged.
III. Education of Civilian Officials

The recommendation that ministers should have adequate knowledge and understanding of defence and the armed forces, and that this knowledge should not be developed on the job only, is perhaps ambitious, but no less important because of that. Political realities may of course always hinder this, and the quality of the advice that is provided to ministers from officials will therefore continue to be of great importance. The paper has already referred to problems with advice provided to UK ministers in respect of deployments in Afghanistan. Ministers did not understand the implications of that advice, perhaps because submissions were not clear, and also lacked confidence in the advice because political risk factors were not necessarily included.

A problem in the UK’s Ministry of Defence is that the civil service role has become less predominant and expert than it used to be, despite the long-standing existence of integrated military/civilian teams across the defence establishment and armed forces. This significant change from the past is the result of two factors. First, the fact that fewer civil servants have direct experience of defence prior to joining the department, and struggle to develop expertise even when they have joined because of the their constant rotation between different roles (and even different departments across government), and the emphasis placed on developing generalist as opposed to specialist knowledge and skills.

Secondly, it reflects the fact that the civil service was at its peak in defence when nuclear weapons were considered the primary risk to the UK: nuclear deterrence was a politico-military issue, where political advice and context were more important than military specifications and clearly drove military options and planning. In the current strategic context other operations dominate, and it is often assumed that civil servants are unable to provide advice on them. At the operational and tactical levels this view has started to change as a result of experience in Afghanistan and Iraq, where understanding local contexts is regarded as a vital enabler, but at the higher levels of defence strategy and planning it remains the case that military advice tends to dominate at the expense of politico-military views. This situation is reinforced by the fact that civil servants are not viewed as experts, given the emphasis placed on maintaining generalists.

Resolving this situation will require defence policy and planning to be regarded as a profession in its own right, and one which officials cannot just come in and out of. This recognition would have significant implications for how career development is structured and incentivised, and for the education and training of individuals. It would reverse the current approach which treats officials across the civil service as a single
or common entity who have the same requirements. There would be implications for civilian involvement in defence training and education: some civilians attend Defence Academy courses at present, but on an ad hoc selection basis, and there is a risk that the civil service training provision (which is generalist) comes at the cost of immersing officials into defence-specific education and understanding. As the Joint Services Command and Staff College has noted: ‘defence’s ability to contribute to the making of national strategy depends upon the Civil Service developing its people in a structured manner to discharge their responsibilities as defence professionals’.

The Ministry of Defence acknowledges that it has little knowledge of the skills of its civilian workforce, and, indeed, that no civilian workforce planning model exists at present. While steps are being taken to develop proper planning mechanisms, the key question is what skills are required. The defence reform process is prioritising skills such as leadership in running a business, including financial areas such as balance of investment and resource allocation, and project management. Substantive knowledge of, and expertise in, capability and defence policy issues is not being prioritised. The risk is that, while officials may be able to scrutinise (and assist ministers to scrutinise) Command Plans from a financial sustainability perspective, they will not understand how the Plans contribute to a coherent force structure.

The civilian staff side of the Indian Ministry of Defence shares many similarities with that of the UK civil service. In India, the MoD is staffed by civilian bureaucrats who are mostly drawn from the Indian Administrative Service. The Administrative Service is generalist, and most officials therefore lack domain expertise. They also rotate between different departments. This is not to suggest that the officials have no authority within the defence establishment: they have significant financial oversight powers, for instance, but two issues remain: ensuring coherent force structure, and being able to challenge the single services effectively. As the military regards civilians as having little knowledge or expertise, it has no inclination to share planning with them; civilian officials in turn feel threatened by the military, and are reluctant to encourage calls for a Chief of Defence Staff figure (which they would regard as a further strengthening of the military pillar at their expense). Indian defence ministers rely on civilian advice, but this is no match for single service knowledge. Civilian participation in military education and training establishments is also low; civilians are usually posted to the National Defence College when they are on compassionate leave or have injuries, and after this education are usually posted out of the defence sector.

It follows that, for both India and the UK,

- A distinction must be made between civilian control of the military, and bureaucratic control of the military. The former is underpinned by expertise in defence issues, which should be fostered. The latter is ineffective and creates tension and mistrust with the defence establishment, as well as inertia.

- Defence policy and planning should be regarded as a profession in its own right. An overriding emphasis on business skills is misplaced.

- Career tracks should be developed for civilians in the defence field, and there should be incentives for officials to specialise in defence.

- Job postings for civilian officials in defence should be for longer periods.

- A rigorous audit of the training requirements for civilians should be undertaken.
  - Civilian officials working in defence should have bespoke training and education, not just generalist civil service training alongside officials from all other government departments.
  - There should be formal and structured opportunities for (more) civilians to participate in the training and education provided by military establishments.

- These recommendations should be underpinned by a proper civilian workforce planning model.

- Innovative education and training methods should be developed, such as executive programmes, as part of a modular approach to meeting training and education requirements. This will help limit the impact of time away for educational purposes on operational output.

- Politico-military considerations should have primacy at the higher levels of defence management and planning, not just consideration of military plans and capability specifications.
IV. Education of the Armed Forces

Just as there are problems with the knowledge and skills base of civilian officials working in defence in both the UK and India, so there are also deficiencies in the professional military education provided to members of the armed forces (notably at officer level).

There are challenges in balancing all the potential requirements of officer training and education, of course: ‘Achieving a coherent through-career professional military education system that inculcates military science, art and critical reasoning skills and blends intellectual ability with emotional intelligence, political awareness and contextual understanding presents a range of inherent implementation challenges. Where should art blend with science? Does current education focus the military mind on tactical victories or open it to a full understanding of the wider security context and the meaning of strategic success?’

Across the globe, militaries require new recruits to master technical skills, and it is assumed that acquiring higher rank and management responsibilities dictates the point at which additional skills should be fostered; indeed, a prevalent view has tended to be that, as only a small number of officers will be selected for the very highest ranks, only that small number of people should be required to develop the ability to think strategically.

There are generational gaps and perspectives in defining educational requirements, notably in relation to this point about strategic education. For example, students at the Indian Army War College receive two introductory lectures on strategy, but, when asked if this was sufficient, said they should receive more instruction in this area. In the UK, having the opportunity to acquire a master’s-level education only during the Advanced Command and Staff Course is regarded as too late to be developing applied thinking skills. On the other hand, the nature of the Higher Command and Staff Course is a model for other countries.

Strategic skills is one area that is lacking in current approaches to professional military education in the UK and India, but are other specialisms are as well. For example, the Indian system perpetuates a generalist officer cadre, with policies that do not emphasise regional or functional specialisms. As a result, the military lacks experts in areas such as area studies, terrorist and extremist groups, counter-insurgency and doctrinal development. A similar situation exists in the UK, though through experimentation the British Army has identified the US military’s foreign-service cadre as a good model to adopt and adapt. However, this approach should be applied to technology areas as well. It will involve a significant change to military career management;

8. Ibid.
usually military career structures are aligned by rank and selection to the education available. Single services have not often identified and nurtured very special leadership talent or specialist skills, such as strategic thinking, procurement, or project management, and have not matched individuals to a refined set of development objectives. Yet prioritising these skills becomes more important as the nature of conflict becomes more complex, and as single services (particularly in the UK, following the Levene Report, but also in India) have greater autonomy over their budgets and equipment programmes.

Part of the challenge with such approaches is ensuring that the armed forces do not lose focus on their professional craft. For example, the US Army War College has been criticised for focussing purely on liberal arts, and the UK’s Advanced Command and Staff Course has been criticised for not teaching staff work. If individuals need to be educated in specialist areas at earlier stages, it follows that particular talents should be identified during general training and reflected in annual reports. This would follow the US model, where a few individuals are identified early on and selected for intensive education in strategic skills and interagency working (and other specialist areas). Producing individuals in the future will rely on careful selection and recruitment (potentially also based on university studies), focused and effective through-life personal development and carefully honed talent management. Not all people will need the same level and type of education. A benefit of this selectivity is that courses will be more substantive: in the UK, the Initial Command and Staff Course has been criticised for only going at the pace of the lowest calibre member, given a lack of proper consideration about who should attend.

This approach would result in a ‘professional majority’ that exists outside executive and technical career paths, who could continue to focus on core skills, and who would only have general notions of strategy and other areas introduced to them. To maintain the professional craft of those who are chosen to specialise in different areas, innovative forms of education should be explored, such as executive programmes.

To enable these changes, specialisms need to become more structured rather than personality driven. The Indian military curriculum is particularly personality driven, and can therefore change suddenly. In areas such as strategy the UK has a similar problem, and in both countries there is a tendency within the military (and land forces in particular) to discourage or even discriminate against higher education such as master’s programmes: this tendency needs to be overcome.

A further enabler of successful military education and training is the involvement of civilians. In India, the faculty at staff colleges and other
military institutions are almost exclusively service officers deputised for relatively short tenures. Furthermore, Indian civil servants do not help define the military’s educational requirements (though the head of the National Defence College can be a civilian or military figure). This is in marked contrast to the situation in the UK, where it is recognised that the military need to understand policy and the political aspects of their craft (which civilians specialise in). Therefore, the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Defence sits on the Defence Academy Board and the steering group for the syllabus of the Royal College of Defence Studies, and there has been a noticeable trend to appoint civilian directors of the Defence Academy on a regular basis. The UK has also exploited the education market to good effect, going into partnership with world-leading universities to provide higher education.

This paper recommends that:

- Studies be undertaken to identify the generational gaps and perspectives in what professional military education should seek to achieve.

- The armed forces foster greater specialisation in strategic skills and key functional and technical areas, by identifying an individual’s potential in these areas at the stage of basic/general training, and by creating distinct training and education paths for these people.

- This approach must be enabled by ensuring that professional military education and training in specialist areas is structured rather than personality driven, and by overcoming tendencies within the military to regard higher education as unnecessary.

- This approach must be enabled by the involvement of civilians in defining the military’s educational requirements, and helping to provide education and training. This reflects the fact that the military must understand the policy and political aspects of their craft, but also that the civilian market in education provision is innovative (through things like executive and fellowship programmes, and e-learning).

- Novel ways of providing specialist education and training must be developed, to help ensure the armed forces do not lose focus on their professional craft.
V. Military and Cross-Government Integration

While single service and higher education and training can be used to broaden individual perspectives and provide better understanding of the context within which the military instrument is used, this is not sufficient by itself. Greater integration is required between individual services, and other government departments and agencies, to meet the challenges of the future strategic context, and also because – in the UK – of the small scale and financial situation facing the armed forces. How ministries of defence and armed forces structure themselves to interact better amongst themselves, and with other government departments, should therefore be part of the defence reform agenda. At an operational level there tends to be more of a permeable membrane between these different organisations, for example through integrated embassies, but the problem is putting this together at the strategic level.

A number of approaches can be taken to help achieve this:

- Having a mixed identity within single services and the department, to build up shared experiences and comfort with working with others. This will involve changes to career management and planning, not only within defence, but across government.

- Establishing joint organisations, either pan-defence (as the UK has done with the new Joint Forces Command), or on specific issues such as cyber, space and logistics which then drive co-operation. Alternatively, lead services for roles and missions could be designated which are required as part of their leadership role to integrate the capabilities of other forces and agencies.

- Establishing a pan-defence mechanism for providing assurance of training and exercising, and possibly requiring services to develop joint training plans.

- Ensuring that jointery and cross-government collaboration have senior champions in defence, at political and military levels. This could include establishing a Chief of Defence Staff position, with concomitant changes to promotion criteria for senior appointments, or a Chairman of the Joint Chiefs model. The problem with the latter is that acting through a committee is often ineffective: a single point of authority is needed, and this is the key criterion to bear in mind.

- Establishing a joint command for expeditionary and domestic operations, so that resource-allocation decisions relating both to operations and force generation are made in a single place, in a
co-ordinated way, and with complete visibility of the demands on defence.

- Ensuring liaison between Chiefs of Staff and other government departments on a formal and regular basis, to build foreign policy (and other policy area) considerations into chiefs’ decisions and planning. This will require other departments to appoint individuals dedicated to defence engagement.

- Bringing people from across government into staff colleges and defence academies, which helps foster shared understanding and culture. From the UK’s experience, including people from across government on the Higher Command and Staff Course has helpfully shifted the military’s attention away from questions purely about planning operations to issues of co-ordination and effect, and is a model of best practice internationally.

- Improving the ability of defence to articulate itself, and its capabilities, to others in government through the National Security Council.
VI. The Utility of Experimentation

Many of these recommendations will challenge vested interests within defence, and could be difficult to achieve given the conservative nature of military organisations. A key way of driving reform without conflict is through experimentation.

Experimentation aims to develop an evidence base from a range of tools, including lessons, research, exercises and experiments, upon which to test existing capabilities and identify new requirements. Through this, experimentation seeks to challenge and embarrass people about the state of capabilities and capacities. The British Army has established this systematic force development process, known as Exercise Agile Warrior, and it is a model of best practice drawing on the experience of the US Joint Forces Command. However, while Agile Warrior has helped the British Army define its future structures and capabilities, there are two notable weaknesses. First, it is only a single service process, with limited engagement with the air and maritime forces. Secondly, cross-government involvement in the experimentation process is very limited.

This paper therefore recommends that:

• All services establish an experimentation process to test existing capabilities and identify new requirements.

• A pan-defence experimentation process be established to help foster integration between individual services (in the UK owned by Joint Forces Command).

• The experimentation process involve other government departments and agencies to help embed the interagency approach in the culture of the armed forces.
VII. Conclusion

The drivers for defence reform differ from country to country, but dialogue between the UK and India has identified that, notwithstanding contextual differences, there are a number of common enablers for successful reform and the effective generation of defence outputs. These primarily relate to leadership and knowledge, both of which are underpinned by effective education and training to build up expertise in defence matters. There is a risk that any reforms will be purely structural, and miss the substance of defence output and effect. Moreover, successful reform cannot be achieved without unified leadership from the political, civil service, and military heads of defence establishments.