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Transition

POLITICAL-MILITARY ESTIMATE PROCESS

HQ NATO
NIWS (NATO Intelligence and Warning System)

HQ NATO MC 133 (Operations Planning System)

HQ NATO CEP (Civil Emergency Planning)

ACO Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive

Strategic Concept
**Planning Categories**

**ADVANCE PLANNING**
- CONTINGENCY PLAN (COP)
  - Generic
  - Possible risk
  - Not executable
  - Basis for OPLAN
  - MC approved

**CRISIS RESPONSE PLANNING**
- STANDING DEFENCE PLAN (SDP)
  - Specific
  - Executable
  - COM Terms Of Reference
  - NAC approved

**OPERATION PLAN (OPLAN)**
- Response to crisis
- COP-based
- Specific
- Execution capable
- NAC approved

... for FUTURE TASKS

... for CURRENT TASKS

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
From GOP to COPD

ACO GUIDELINES TO OPERATIONAL PLANNING

2005

OPERATIONAL PLANNING

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

ALLIED COMMAND OPERATIONS COMPREHENSIVE OPERATIONS PLANNING DIRECTIVE COPD INTERIM V1.0
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NATO UNCLASSIFIED
Collaborative Planning

As part of the collaborative planning process documents submitted to the NAC will also be passed to subordinate Cdrs.

NATO Crisis Response Planning

Phase 1 Indicators and Warnings
Phase 2 Assessment of the Crisis
Phase 3 Development of Response Options
Phase 4 Planning
Phase 5 Execution
Phase 6 Transition

Phase 1 Situation Awareness
Phase 2 Strategic Assessment
Phase 3 Military Response Options
Phase 4a Strategic CONOPS Development
Phase 4b Strategic OPLAN Development (Force Generation)
Phase 5 Execution Assessment/OPLAN Review
Phase 6 Transition

Phase 1 Situation Awareness
Phase 2 Operational Appreciation/Assessment of Options
Phase 3 Operational Orientation
Phase 4a Operational CONOPS Development
Phase 4b Operational OPLAN Development
Phase 5 Execution/Campaign Assessment OPLAN Review
Phase 6 Transition

As part of the collaborative planning process documents submitted to the NAC will also be passed to subordinate Cdrs.
• Collaboration

"A process where two or more people or organisations work together to realise shared goals"
Philosophy & Intent

- Horizontal and Vertical Collaboration
  - Knowledge Development
  - Planning
  - Execution
- Commanders & Staffs
- Services and Functions
- Civil & Military Entities
- Full exploitation of the wide range of expertise to ensure common understanding of what needs to be done (comprehensive approach)
- Enhanced effect – sooner
• Common doctrine, SOP & SOIs
• Co-location – embedded planning teams
• Integration of civil and military actors
• Connectivity
  – Personal
  – Technical (the collaborative information environment)
  – 3 level collaboration
Synchronous Collaboration Tools:

- JCHAT
- TOPFAS
- VTC

Asynchronous Collaboration Tools:

- WEB portals/Wise
- Document and management systems
- E-mail
“Planning is everything; plans are nothing.”
“No battle plan survives contact with the enemy.”

Field Marshal Helmuth Graf von Moltke
3. The COPD outlines the procedures and responsibilities governing the preparation, approval, assessment, implementation and review of operations plans to ensure a common approach to operations planning. It is applicable to all operations planning activities at the strategic and operational levels of command within the NATO Command Structure. It may also be adapted to the component/tactical level, as well as appropriate elements of the NATO Force Structure in order to enhance collaborative planning activities.
Joint Operational Planning Group

- Strategic
- Operational
- Tactical

JOPG
(JPB/"J5")
Phase 1 – Situation Awareness
Phase 1 – Situation Awareness

Purpose:
- To develop and maintain a level of understanding to support operational assessments and the provision of operational level of advice and decision making to SACEUR during the planning for and conduct of operations.

Products:
- Commander’s requests for information;
- Key judgements about the situation in the area (risks and threats);
- Conditions, trends and tendencies in the area;
- Assessment of NATO indicators and warnings.
New type of conflict

Traditional Approach

- Corps / MEF / Fleet / NAF
- M on M (Attrition-based)
- Tactical
- Independent
- Symmetrical
- Massed Forces
- Massed Fires
- Lethality
- Combat

Comprehensive Approach

- Joint Force Commander (JFC)
- PMEC on PMESII (Effects-based)
- Strategic / Operational
- Interdependent / Nested
- Asymmetrical
- Massed Electrons
- Precision Fires / ISR
- Lethal and Nonlethal
- Combat / PKO / HA / CMO
The four Instruments of Power (MPEC)

- **Military.** The military is NATO’s main instrument. It refers to the application of military power, including the threat or use of lethal and non-lethal force, to coerce, deter, contain or defeat an adversary, including the disruption and destruction of its critical military and non-military capabilities.

- **Political.** The political instrument refers to the use of political power, in particular in the diplomatic arena cooperating with various actors, to influence an adversary or to create advantageous conditions.

- **Economic.** The economic instrument generally refers to initiatives and sanctions designed to affect the flow of goods and services, as well as financial support to state and non-state actors involved in a crisis.

- **Civil.** The civil instrument refers to the use of powers contained within such areas as judiciary, constabulary, education, public information and civilian administration and support infrastructure, which can lead to access to medical care, food, power and water. It also includes the administrative capacities of international, governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGO). The civil instrument is controlled and exercised by sovereign nations, IOs and NGOs.
Today’s adversary is a dynamic, adaptive foe who operates within a complex, interconnected operational environment.
Understand the environment and your adversaries
Purpose:
- to understand the strategic situation and the nature of the problem;
- to understand NATO’s desired end state and objectives;
- to contribute operational advice to SACEUR;
- to assess the operational viability of strategic response options.

Product:
- Commander’s operational advice.
Phase 2 – Assessment and Operational Appreciation

Strategic Level
SACEUR

- Strategic Warning Order
- SACEUR’s Strategic Assessment

Operational Level
JFC

- Initiate the operational assessment
- Develop an Operational appreciation of the crisis
- Appreciate the level and scope of international engagement
- Analyse the end state and strategic objectives

Tactical Level Components

- Operational Warning Order
- Initial CPOE
- Draft Operational Advice
- Tactical Advice

Operational Advice Briefing
- Draft MROs
- Operational Commander’s advice
- Provide operational advice
Phase 3 – Response Options/Orientation

Strategic Level SACEUR

Phase 1: Situation Assessment
Phase 2: Strategic Assessment

Phase 3: Military Response Options
Draft MROs
Strategic Planning Directive

Phase 4a: Strategic CONOPS Development

Phase 4b: Operational OPLAN Development
Operational OPLAN

Phase 6: Transition

Operational Level COM JFC

Phase 1: Initial Assessment
Phase 2: Operational Assessment and Option Development

Phase 3: Operational Orientation
Operational Advice

Phase 4a: Operational CONOPS Development

Operational OPLAN

Phase 6: Transition

Disengagement Planning and Execution
Phase 3 – Response Options/Orientation

Purpose:

- to **determine the operational problem** that must be solved;
- to **determine specific operational conditions** that must be achieved;
- to identify the key operational factors
- to identify any limitations on the commander’s freedom of action.

Product:

- Comprehensive Preparation of the Operational Environment (CPOE).
- The operational design.
- Commander's planning guidance.

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
The purpose of mission analysis is to establish precisely the operational results to be achieved and to identify critical operational requirements, limitations on freedom of action, and inherent risks. It is driven by the strategic assessments, direction and guidance and further influenced by operational estimates, CPOE as well as advice from subordinate commands and cooperating organisations.
Key Collaborative Output Phase 3
The Operational Design

From Strategic Design

To Operational design
**Action**: The process of engaging any Alliance instrument at each level in the engagement space in order to create (a) specific effect(s) in support of an objective.

**Effect**: A change in the behavioural or physical state of a system (or system elements), that results from one or more actions or other causes.

**Objective**: A clearly defined and attainable goal to be achieved in order to establish conditions required to achieve a higher objective and/or the desired end state.

**End State**: The situation to be attained at the end of a strategic engagement.

**Condition**: The unacceptable situation.

**Effect**: A change in the behavioural or physical state of a system (or system elements), that results from one or more actions or other causes.

**Action**: Interacting or interdependent elements forming a unified whole.

**Decisive Point**: A point from which a hostile or friendly centre of gravity can be threatened. This point may exist in time, space or the information environment.

**Lines of Operation**: In a campaign or operation, a logical line (s) linking effects and decisive conditions in time and purpose to an objective.

**Centre of Gravity**: Characteristics, capabilities or localities from which a nation, an alliance, a military force or other grouping derives its freedom of action, physical strength or will to fight.
A secure and stable environment in East Cerasia to allow the delivery of humanitarian aid and to set the conditions for the handing over of security responsibilities to a Cerasian Union force, thereby allowing an orderly withdrawal of NATO-led forces.

- SLOC sufficiently secure to permit FoN and the delivery of HA
- Security in NE Tytan achieved
- Stability is maintained in the East Cerasian region
- Stability in Tytan improved
- Sufficient security and stability established in East Cerasia to allow the delivery of humanitarian aid and to set the conditions for the handing over of security responsibilities to a Cerasian Union force, thereby allowing an orderly withdrawal of NATO-led forces.

**Operational Design (example SFJE 10)**

- **Initiation G-+65**
  - Effective cooperation with HN
  - TYT support NIMFOR

- **Stabilization G+65------G+250**
  - IOs NGOs sufficiently cooperating
  - Coordination with other stakeholders established

- **Transition G+250------G+365**
  - KAMON RECOGNISE TYTAN SOVEREIGNTY
  - KAMON PETRACEROS INFLUENCE

**MARITIME SECURITY**

- 1-PIRACY NO LONGER IMPACTS ON FON
  - Maritime traffic control effective
  - HA ships reach destination SPODs
  - 2-Piracy traffic control implemented
  - HA delivery enabled

**TYTAN SECURITY**

- 2-Shipping traffic in JOA utilise VTMS
  - SLOC in JOA sufficiently secure to exercise freedom of navigation for the delivery of HA
  - Security in NE Tytan achieved
  - Stability in Tytan improved
  - Hostile interference with shipping acceptable
  - PODs & LOCs operational
  - 3-SLOC sufficiently secure to permit FoN and the delivery of HA
  - IAGs threats contained
  - 27-IAG Groups ACTIVITIES MITIGATED
  - 5-Delivery HA in NE Tytan is enabled
  - 24-Ports and LOCs established, secured and maintained
  - Secure and stable environment is achieved in Tytan
  - IAGs/MA AAA
  - PIRACY
  - Tytan SF capabilities improved by NIMFOR assistance
  - 22-Tytan SF capabilities improved by NIMFOR assistance
  - STA: Credible instruments of Power
  - KAMON: Armed Forces
  - UNMEC: Effective relationship with other actors
  - Squadrons: Effective relationship with other actors
  - STE: Credible instruments of Power
  - PET: Credible instruments of Power

**REGIONAL STABILITY**

- Effective cooperation with HN
- TYT support NIMFOR
- KAMON RECOGNISE TYTAN SOVEREIGNTY
- KAMON PETRACEROS INFLUENCE
- IOs NGOs sufficiently cooperating
- Coordination with other stakeholders established
- SUFFICIENT STABILITY IN TYTAN TO HANDOVER TO FOF
- Stability is maintained in the East Cerasian region
- Stability in Tytan improved
- Sufficient security and stability established in East Cerasia to allow the delivery of humanitarian aid and to set the conditions for the handing over of security responsibilities to a Cerasian Union force, thereby allowing an orderly withdrawal of NATO-led forces.
The purpose of mission analysis is to establish precisely the operational results to be achieved and to identify critical operational requirements, limitations on freedom of action, and inherent risks. It is driven by the strategic assessments, direction and guidance and further influenced by operational estimates, CPOE as well as advice from subordinate commands and cooperating organisations.
Phase 4a – CONOPS Development
Purpose:
- Determine how best to carry out operations that will accomplish the mission.

Product:
- Concept of operations.
- Proposed target sets and, as appropriate, target categories.
- Rules of Engagement Request (ROEREQ).
- Combined Joint Statement of Requirements (CJSOR).
Course of Action

- A method for accomplishing the mission.
- A way to implement the operational design by arranging actions in space and time in order set the conditions required to reach the End State.

Who, what, when, where, why **and** how
Decision Briefing

Phase 4a – CONOPS Development

Strategic Context
- Strategic Planning Directive
- Other strategic analysis, assessments

Operational Level
- COM JFC
  - Prepare for operational concept development
  - Analyse opposing COAs and factors influencing COA development
  - Develop own Courses of Action
  - Analyse Courses of Action
  - Compare COAs and select COA for concept development

Operational Factors
- Commander’s Guidance for COA development
- Operational Planning Directive
- Commander’s estimate
- Staff functional estimates
- CPOE
- Advice from subordinates
- Advice from cooperating IOGO/NGOs

Draft Strategic CONOPS
Draft Operational CONOPS
NAC approved Strategic CONOPS with MC Guidance
Operational CONOPS
Approved Operational CONOPS

Operational CONOPS
Combined Joint Statement of Requirement (CJSOR)
Theatre Capabilities Statement of Requirements (TCoS)
Manpower Crisis Establishment

Develop the CONOPS
Develop Force/Capability requirements
Forward the CONOPS and Requirements to SACEUR
Draft Tactical CONOPS
Approved Operational CONOPS
Phase 4b – OPLAN Development
Purpose:
- to develop the arrangements and further specify the required activities;
- to implement and specify the concept of operations;
- to provide a basis for planning by subordinate/supporting commands.

Product:
- Crisis Response Planning: an executable OPLAN.
- Advance Planning:
  • Contingency Plan (COP), or
  • Standing Defence Plan (SDP).
Execution requires the command and control of military forces and interaction with other non-military means to conduct integrated, coordinated or synchronised actions that create desired effects.

Based on assessments and on evaluation of progress the plan will be adjusted accordingly.
The purpose is to develop and coordinate OPLAN for the handover of responsibility to the UN, other international organisations (e.g. EU) or indigenous actor in the crisis area and withdraw NATO forces in a controlled manner so as to avoid this action being a destabilising influence in the region.
• It is a trial/interim version
  – An evolution, not a revolution
  – Still discrepancies
  – A lot of good – new ideas in COPD
• Different mindset – Comprehensive Approach (MPEC)
• Staff at several levels will collaborate to produce the deliverables in concert
  – Increased inclusion and transparency
  – Increased number of actors
  – Increased interaction.
• Transparency and information management
• The planning outputs has not changed a lot – deliverables are the same (CONOPS, OPLAN)
• The Operational Planning Process continues to evolve. There are still too many moving parts
• Working definitions – terminology still to be ratified
• COPD – Still under continuous review
• Lots of associated doctrinal work (handbooks, AJPs, etc.)
Each actor produces uncoordinated actions that generate unplanned effects

RESULT
Crisis solution impossible to predict
Success guaranteed only by continuous IC presence
Long term commitment (and higher cost) as a consequence
A Comprehensive Approach seeks to produce coordinated actions aimed at realizing desired effects in order to achieve an agreed end state.
Future JFHQ v1.8 Model

DCOM

COS

DOM

J7 Force Preparation

J1 Human Resources

J10 Assessment

J2 Knowledge

J3 Operations

J5 Plans & Policy

J39/TEC **

J3/5 Synchronization & Execution

Knowledge Analysis & Production

Effects & Influence

Joint Doctrine

NFS Readiness

DJHQ Readiness/Trg

Eval & Certification

Doctrine & NFS Interoperability

Land Doctrine

Lessons Learned

NATO Exercise & Preparation Spt

MIL Pers

Civ Pers

J6 CIS

J8 Financial

J9 Civ-Mil Interaction & Mil Partnership

Civ-Mil Interaction

Mil Partnerships

J39/TEC **

* No global agreement on that name

** Generated from J9 for deployment
As part of the collaborative planning process documents submitted to the MC will also be passed to subordinate Cdrs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Operational Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theatre geometry</td>
<td>Possible access, staging, entry, operating areas, bases and distances, lines of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communications, sustainment, etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical/oceanographic</td>
<td>Observation, obstacles, movement/mobility, key terrain, littorals, choke points,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characteristics</td>
<td>international sea lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological characteristics</td>
<td>Visibility, ground mobility, air operations, maritime operations, risks to exposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population demographics</td>
<td>Human development, population movement, displaced populations/refugees, dependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on humanitarian aid, populations at risk, unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political situation</td>
<td>Credibility, popularity, effectiveness of governments to provide for the basic needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the populace, opposition, stability, status of forces agreements, rule of law,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military and security situation</td>
<td>External/internal threats, surrogates and proxy forces, illegally armed groups,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extremism/terrorism, operational areas, military dispositions, police, para-military</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic situation</td>
<td>Availability of money, food, energy, raw materials, industry, services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-cultural situation</td>
<td>Social cohesion/conflicts, dominant groups, extremism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and medical situation</td>
<td>Risk of famine, diseases, epidemics, environmental hazards, available medical support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure situation</td>
<td>Adequacy of transportation and communications nodes and networks; POL storage and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and media situation</td>
<td>Control/bias/manipulation of media, public access to information, use of propaganda,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>robustness of communications</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE OPERATIONAL PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED.

MOO 1
Secure the Airport Property

MOO 2
Re-establish full functionality at the airport

MOO 3
Establish Security from External Threats at the airport

END STATE
A secure and efficient airport environment able to offer flights to international aid organizations which are free of threats.

UNDESIRED STATE
Airport controlled and threatened by guerilla fighters

PRE-CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS

RISKS
ASSUMPTIONS
PRE-CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS
FACTOR ANALYSIS
CIV-MIL
CONSTRAINTS / RESTRICTIONS
CRITICAL CAPABILITIES

GIVEN TO JOPG

OPPOSITE

THE OPERATIONAL PROBLEM TO BE SOLVED.

MOO 1
Secure the Airport Property

MOO 2
Re-establish full functionality at the airport

MOO 3
Establish Security from External Threats at the airport

END STATE
A secure and efficient airport environment able to offer flights to international aid organizations which are free of threats.

UNDESIRED STATE
Airport controlled and threatened by guerilla fighters

PRE-CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS

RISKS
ASSUMPTIONS
PRE-CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESS
FACTOR ANALYSIS
CIV-MIL
CONSTRAINTS / RESTRICTIONS
CRITICAL CAPABILITIES

GIVEN TO JOPG
Good work, but I think we might need just a little more detail right here.

JOPG Chief

CJTF COMMANDER
Infrastructure Requirements

- COA Red
- Powerpoint
- COA Blue
- SynchroMat

- White Cell
- Green Cell
- Functional Experts CC-Liaison
- Scribe Blue Cell
- Scribe Red Cell
- Functional Experts CC-Liaison

- Referee
- Co-ordinator
- KD Analysts
- Scribe
- Op Analysts
Example

- Flexibility
- Tempo
- Operational risk
- Logistic simplicity
- Collateral damage

COA recommendation

NATO UNCLASSIFIED
Overall layout of OPP (Phases 2, 3 and 4a)

WHAT?
- Phase 1/2
- Knowledge Dev. SoS
- Orientation
- Orientation
- PMESII analysis CPOE

MEANS
- MA
  - FA T/S/F
  - R of HG
  - Effects Actions
  - OP DESIGN (DC/DP)
  - CRM / CCIR/ROEs
  - Enablers Early Deployment Requirement
  - IFE Assumptions

OP advice
- NAC ID SSA MROs
- PMESII analysis CPOE
- Orientation
- Orientation
- JTTL

Phase 3 Products
- MAB CPG

JTTL
- LOO
- Direct App
- Indirect App
- Branch/Sequel

Phase 4a
- Continuous Phase 4a
- OPT1
- OPT2
- OPT3

Review of CPG
- Factors affecting COA Dev Risks
- Common requirements, NRF, FoF Alternatives

HOW? (MPEC)
- Viability Check
- COA UPDATE
- Gen Concept
- Phasing
- SYNCH MATRIX
- Start/End Main Effort DPs
- Effects Actions

Refinement
- *Adv/Disadv
- *Risks
- *Gaps
- *Refine - OPDESIGN - CJSOR - effects - Actions - Timeline

WARGAME
- *Refinement
- COM's COA
- SELECTION Criteria

DECISION
- Products
  - *CONOPS
  - *ROEREQ
  - *CJSOR

ENDS
- From JTTL to CJSOR Force /St/CRD/FD

ENDSTATE
- Acceptable Conditions To be established

ALLIANCE
- STR/MIL OBJ
- STR/MIL OBJ

From JTTL to CJSOR Force /St/CRD/FD

See List of Abbreviations
As part of the collaborative planning process documents submitted to the MC will also be passed to subordinate Cdrs.