Product Identification Information

Title: *The United States is Not Ready for Cyber Attack*

Date Evaluated: 14 March 2017

DNI Evaluator #: DNI-009

Scores Awarded:

Literal Response Criterion 1: Properly describes quality and credibility of underlying sources, data, and methodologies.	1
Literal Response Criterion 2: Demonstrates customer relevance and addresses implications.	3
Inferential Response Criterion 1: Properly distinguishes between factual reporting and assumptions and judgments.	1
Inferential Response Criterion 2: Properly expresses and explains uncertainties associated with major analytic judgments.	1
Evaluative Response Criterion 1: Uses clear and logical argumentation.	2
Evaluative Response Criterion 2: Incorporates analysis of alternatives.	2

Comments: *Overall solid product; greatest strength is its relevance.*

A.   Literal Response Criteria

Solvers' submissions against the Literal Response Criteria will be scored as the arithmetic sum of the scores for Criteria 1 and 2, as outlined below. AIS will make the ultimate determination of the winner for the Literal award category.

Literal Response Criterion 1: Properly describes quality and credibility of underlying sources, data, and methodologies.

Background: Solvers' submissions should accurately characterize the information in the underlying sources and explain which information proved key to analytic judgments and why. Factors significantly affecting the weighting that the analysis gives to available, relevant information, such as denial and deception, source access, source motivations and bias, or age and continued currency of information, or other factors affecting the quality and potential reliability of the information, should be included in the product.

□ Poor (0)	□ Fair (1)	□ Good (2)	□ Excellent (3)
□ Largely lacks sourcing or describes reporting base, data, or methodologies only vaguely; *OR* □ Misidentifies or misrepresents cited reporting, data, or methodologies.	X□ Contains basic, generic descriptions of cited reporting, data, or methodologies; *BUT* X□ Provides little detail on factors that may affect the quality and credibility of underlying sources, data, or methodologies.	□ Contains at least basic, generic descriptions of cited reporting, data, or methodologies; *AND* □ Provides considerable detail on factors that may affect the quality and credibility of underlying sources, data, or methodologies.	□ Satisfies "good" criteria; *AND* □ Identifies which sources are most important to major analytic judgments; *OR* □ Provides additional detail about sources, data, or methodologies that provides insight into their contribution to the analysis.

RATING COMMENT: *No insight provided as to who panel of experts are, who senior leaders are, or level of NATO officials*

Note: Source reference citations should be included as endnotes in disseminated analytic products. In rating this standard, the totality of information in a product's source reference citation endnotes, source summary statement, and main text must be taken into account.

<u>Literal Response Criterion 2</u>: Demonstrates customer relevance and addresses implications.

Background: Solvers' submissions should provide information and insight on issues relevant to the products' intended consumers and/or provide useful context. To meet this standard fully, Solvers' submissions should examine and explicitly address direct or near-term implications of the information for the intended audience and/or for U.S. national security interests, and, when possible, also relay longer-term implications or identify potential indirect or second-order effects.

□ Poor (0)	□ Fair (1)	□ Good (2)	□ Excellent (3)
□ Provides little or no information or analysis beyond what is generally known; *OR* □ Does not respond adequately to a specific tasking.	□ Provides useful information and analysis but does not address implications; *OR* □ Does not address an important issue or question raised by the analysis; *OR* □ Satisfies a specific tasking only partially.	X□ Provides useful information and analysis and addresses near-term, direct, or first-order implications; *AND* X□ Adds value by addressing at least one of the following: trends or prospects, appropriate context, insight gained from synthesizing a large volume of information, warning of threats to U.S. interests, or factors affecting opportunities for U.S. actions (without prescribing U.S. policy); *OR* □ Satisfies a specific tasking fully.	X□ Satisfies "good" criteria; *AND* X□ Assesses longer-term, indirect, or second-order implications; *OR* □ Provides exceptionally expert analysis (*e.g.*, by drawing on multiple disciplines or presenting illuminating comparisons); *OR* □ Warns of threats in detail (*e.g.*, by discussing specific indicators, likelihood, or imminence); *OR* □ Analyzes in detail factors affecting opportunities for U.S. action (*e.g.*, by discussing risks, benefits, or possible reactions to potential U.S. actions).

RATING COMMENT: *Clearly addresses "so what" of lack of clarity as to who is in charge and how to deal with national/international cyber incident.*

B. Inferential Response Criteria

Solvers' submissions against the Inferential Response Criteria will be scored as the arithmetic sum of the scores for Criteria 1 and 2, as outlined below. AIS will make the ultimate determination of the winner for the **Inferential** award category.

<u>Inferential Response Criterion 1</u>: **Properly distinguishes between factual reporting and assumptions and judgments.**

Background: For the purposes of this standard, assumptions are defined as explicit or implicit hypotheses that may affect outcomes or that affect the way in which information is interpreted or weighed. They deal with identifying underlying causes and/or behavior of systems, people, organizations, states, or conditions. Assumptions comprise the foundational premises on which the information and logical argumentation build to reach analytic conclusions. Assumptions may also span information gaps that would otherwise inhibit the analysis from reaching defensible judgments. Judgments are defined as logical inferences from the available information or the results of explicit tests of hypotheses. They comprise the conclusions of the analysis.

Solvers' submissions should explicitly identify the critical assumptions on which the analysis is based and explain the implications for judgments if those assumptions are incorrect. As appropriate, Solvers' submissions should identify indicators that would signal whether assumptions or judgments are more or less likely to be correct.

□ Poor (0)	□ Fair (1)	□ Good (2)	□ Excellent (3)
□ Does not distinguish among statements that convey underlying information, assumptions, and judgments.	X□ Sometimes distinguishes among statements that convey underlying information, assumptions, and judgments; *OR* □ Does not explicitly state assumptions that serve as linchpins of an argument or bridge key information gaps.	□ Consistently distinguishes among statements that convey underlying information, assumptions, and judgments; *AND* □ Explicitly states assumptions that serve as linchpins of an argument or bridge key information gaps.	□ Satisfies "good" criteria; *AND* □ Identifies indicators that, if detected, could validate or refute judgments or assumptions; *OR* □ Explains the implications for judgments if assumptions are incorrect.

RATING COMMENT: *Use of source descriptors and source reference citations good but not always clear what is a judgment, what is reporting*

Inferential Response Criterion 2: Properly expresses and explains uncertainties associated with major analytic judgments.

Background: Solvers' submissions should indicate and explain the basis for the uncertainties associated with major analytic judgments. Sources of uncertainty—including information gaps and significant contrary reporting—should be noted and linked logically and consistently to the uncertainty surrounding judgments. As appropriate, solvers' submissions also should identify indicators that would alter the levels of uncertainty for major analytic judgments.

□ Poor (0)	□ Fair (1)	□ Good (2)	□ Excellent (3)
□ **Does not indicate levels of uncertainty associated with major analytic judgments;** *OR* □ **Indicates levels of uncertainty associated with major analytic judgments that are inconsistent with the basis ascribed to them.**	**X** □ **Indicates levels of uncertainty associated with major analytic judgments;** *BUT* □ **Does not explain their basis (***e.g.***, by reference to strengths and weaknesses of the information base, contrary reporting, assumptions, or the nature of the judgment).**	□ **Indicates levels of uncertainty associated with major analytic judgments;** *AND* □ **Explains their basis (***e.g.***, by reference to strengths and weaknesses of the information base, contrary reporting, assumptions, or the nature of the judgment).**	□ **Satisfies "good" criteria;** *AND* □ **Provides especially thorough discussion of nature and sources of uncertainties affecting major analytic judgments;** *OR* □ **Identifies indicators that, if detected, would alter levels of uncertainty associated with major analytic judgments.**

RATING COMMENT: *Almost all statements/judgments are written in declarative prose, suggesting high confidence; there is no acknowledgement of information gaps, the degree of uncertainty*

C. Evaluative Response Criteria

Solvers' submissions against the Evaluative Response Criteria will be scored as the arithmetic sum of the scores for Criteria 1 and 2, as outlined below. AIS will make the ultimate determination of the winner for the Evaluative award category.

Evaluative Response Criterion 1: Uses clear and logical argumentation.

Background: Solvers' submissions should facilitate clear understanding of the information and reasoning underlying analytic judgments. Key points should be effectively supported by information or, for more speculative warning or "think pieces," by coherent reasoning. Language and syntax should convey meaning unambiguously. Solvers' submissions should be internally consistent and acknowledge significant supporting and contrary information affecting key judgments.

□ Poor (0)	□ Fair (1)	□ Good (2)	□ Excellent (3)
□ Lacks a main analytic message; OR □ Does not support analytic judgments with relevant evidence or undermines them by using flawed logic; OR □ Often uses unclear language or uses a structure that is not easily understood.	□ Presents a main analytic message; BUT □ Does not combine evidence, context, and assumptions effectively to support analytic judgments or uses weak logic; OR □ Sometimes uses unclear language or a structure that at times is not easily understood.	**X**□ Presents a prominent and clear main analytic message; AND **X**□ Presents clear reasoning with no flaws in logic and effectively combines evidence, context, and assumptions to support analytic judgments; AND **X**□ Uses clear language and a structure that displays a logical flow appropriate for the argument being presented.	□ Satisfies "good" criteria; AND □ Addresses any inconsistent or contrary information in a way that reconciles it with analytic judgments; OR □ Demonstrates notable skill or sophistication in combining evidence, context, and assumptions convincingly to support analytic judgments.

RATING COMMENT: *Clear analytic message, generally well developed and supported*

Evaluative Response Criterion 2: Incorporates analysis of alternatives.

Background: Analysis of alternatives is the systematic evaluation of differing hypotheses to explain events or phenomena, explore near-term outcomes, and imagine possible futures to mitigate surprise and risk. Analytic products should identify and assess plausible alternative hypotheses. This is particularly important when major judgments must contend with significant uncertainties, or complexity (e.g., forecasting future trends), or when low probability events could produce high-impact results. In discussing alternatives, products should address factors such as associated assumptions, likelihood, or implications related to U.S. interests. Products also should identify indicators that, if detected, would affect the likelihood of identified alternatives.

□ Poor (0)	□ Fair (1)	□ Good (2)	□ Excellent (3)
□ Does not present alternatives when uncertainties, complexity, or low probability/ high impact situations warrant their inclusion.	□ Presents alternatives when uncertainties, complexity, or low probability/high impact situations warrant their inclusion; *BUT* □ Does not explain the evidence and reasoning that underpin them *or* discuss their likelihood or implications related to U.S. interests	X□ Presents alternatives when uncertainties, complexity, or low probability/high impact situations warrant their inclusion; *AND* X□ Explains the evidence and reasoning that underpin them; *AND* X□ Discusses their likelihood or implications related to U.S. interests	□ Satisfies "good" criteria; *AND* □ Identifies indicators that, if detected, would affect the likelihood of any identified alternatives.

RATING COMMENT: *Although the textbox on retaliating with non-cyber means is not an alternative to the product's main analytic message, it does address an alternative to the presumed response.*