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Introduction

- RUDE Cycle describes passage of orders down command structure
- Commander assess orders of direct subordinates, and their subordinates etc
- Range of potential variables
- Assessment Tool
- Plot communication events on timeline
Command Structure

- Brigade Commander (CMD)
  - Battle-group Commander (SUB1)
    - Company/Squadron Commander (SUB2)
      - Platoon/Troop Commander (SUB3)
Command Structure

Diagram:
- CMD
- BG
- SUB1
  - SQDN
  - SQDN
- SUB2
  - COY
  - COY
- SUB3
  - PLN
  - PLN
  - PLN
Scope for Order Assessment
Fundamental Question

Did SUBs show clear commitment to the Orders passed down to them?

• Requires military SME judgement
• Phrasing of question should be revised
Quantitative Measures

- British forces follow 1/3-2/3 rule
- Time-line from “Start” to “H-hour”
- Record events:
  - Time of issue of Warning orders
  - Time of issue of CONOP orders
  - Time of issue of Confirmatory orders
Further variables could also be measured:

- Length of order (in pages, words etc)
- Length of each sentence
- Number of sentences
- Time for each query (if any)
- Number of queries (if any)
## Terminology

### Proposed notation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brigade</th>
<th>Battlegroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bde-CMD</td>
<td>BdeSub-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlegroup</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BdeSub-1</td>
<td>Bde SUB-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O-sub-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Platoon/Troop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bde SUB-2</td>
<td>Bde SUB-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O-sub-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platoon/Troop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bde SUB-3</td>
<td>O-sub-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessment

- Commander assesses orders at two (and perhaps) three levels down
- Assessment Tool in development
- Based on Osgood Semantic Differential
- Computerised survey with 5-7 questions applied to each Order
Assessment – 1st Step

First step: single assessment of each Order, one question asked:

“Do these Orders use the available forces to best serve my Intent?”
Assessment – 2nd Step

Second step: detailed assessment of Orders - set of questions based on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UK OPORD</th>
<th>US 5-Paragraph</th>
<th>US 4-Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Situation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Mission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution</td>
<td>Execution</td>
<td>General Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>Service Support</td>
<td>Special Instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command &amp; Signal</td>
<td>Command &amp; Signal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tool Development

- Draft the initial questions
- Recast them so that they are not dichotomous
- Choose descriptors
- Write question set into tool
Tool Development

“Do these Orders use the available forces to best serve my Intent?”

Now might become:

“To what degree do these Orders use the available forces to best serve my Intent?”

“Poorly” “Very well”
Tool Development

"To what degree do these Orders use the available forces to best serve your Intent?"

3.a: what the respondent sees

"To what degree do these Orders use the available forces to best serve your Intent?"

3.b: the response

10% intervals

Minimal | Moderate | Good | Exc

5% intervals

Useless | Poor | Good | Exc

3.c: the application of different scales
Use of Tool Data

- **Saved as Comma Separated Values (\*.csv)**
- **Can export results to spreadsheet:**
  
  Use templates for multiple correlations
  (compare overall and detailed results)
  
  - Highlights any problem areas
  - Grade each instance separately, generate colour-coded rating (e.g. Traffic Light)
Analysis of Results

- Evaluate quantitative variables
- Judgement requires SME input
- E.g. SUB receiving good CMD assessment may have made fewer clarification requests
- Potentially high return of data
De-risking

Could be used in De-risking operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CMD</th>
<th>SUB2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were Orders issued in a timely manner?</td>
<td>Do you have sufficient time to plan/execute orders?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was Urgency well conveyed?</td>
<td>Was Higher Command Intent (or intended effect) made clear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were Locations (AA, FUP, etc) clearly indicated?</td>
<td>Were Routes and Locations clearly indicated?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are waypoint timings achievable?</td>
<td>Are waypoint timings achievable?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are available forces well used?</td>
<td>Do you have adequate support and flank cover?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is artillery support de-conflicted?</td>
<td>Are you happy with artillery support?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are movement bounds clear and unambiguous?</td>
<td>Do advised bounds present any problem?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

We have outlined two-stage approach to assessment of Transmission of Commander’s Intent

- Can produce Quantitative data
- Order Assessment tool in development
- Potential for use in De-risking operations and Junior Officer training
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