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Preparatory Notes to Instructor

Introduction

The US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) – UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP) Comparison is designed to highlight the similarities and differences between the two planning processes. It is however based on the presumption that, qualified military staff officers would have undergone national staff courses as part of their career progression.

This module is intended to provide guidance to staff officers in the performance of their planning duties as they coordinate with their counterparts in their peacekeeping training effort. Staff officers are therefore advised to combine their knowledge and experience, the Force Commander’s style and the peculiarities of the operational area in their planning process.

Aim

The aim of this module is to provide Military Staff Officers with the necessary information to understand the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP).

Learning Outcomes

On completion of this Module, participants will:

- Understand the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP)

Training Sequence

This module could be delivered over a single training sessions, depending on the learning activities used and the level of participants’ comprehension of the process.

Note to Instructor: It is highly recommended for this module to be delivered after the modules on UN Military Component Planning Process. Also, give the participants a brief explanation on why they should pay special attention to this module. Refer to: Background in the Preparatory Notes to the Instructor

Duration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum Session Time</th>
<th>Lecture/Presentation</th>
<th>Questions/Assessment</th>
<th>Session Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 Minutes</td>
<td>45 min</td>
<td>15 min.</td>
<td>0 min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology
The delivery of this module should be based on participatory learning principles in order to keep participants engaged.

Structure of the presentation

- References
- Comparison of MDMP & MCPP
- Receive the Mission vs Guidance
- Mission Analysis
- COA Development
- COA Analysis & Selection
- Produce the Plan
- Summary/Conclusion

Note to Instructor: Instructors are encouraged to use examples and mission-specific information related to the specific deployment of participants during training delivery. In particular, instructors are encouraged to identify who is responsible for each step in the two processes, highlighting civilian or counterpart elements the unit may be required to coordinate with. Discussion should also touch on national support to the unit as this may vary based on the troop contributing country.

Instructor Profile
This module is best presented by a military Senior Staff Course qualified instructor with peacekeeping experience and good understanding of both the United States Army Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the United Nations Military Component Planning Process (MCPP).

Instructor Preparations

General Sources
The material contained in this module draws on training manuals, doctrine, concepts, and best practices provided by Member States and their Peacekeeping Training Centres, UN Missions and UN Headquarters. It also draws on training manuals, doctrine, concepts and best practices of the US Army.

Required Readings
The material listed below form the basis of the guidance material on which this module is based. Instructors should familiarise themselves with these documents prior to preparing their presentations:

- United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines (Capstone)
- US Army Tactics, Techniques and Procedures (ATTP) 5-0.1 The Planning Process (MAR 2006)
General Preparations

Equipment:
1. Computers
2. Projector and Screen
3. Flip Chart

Materials:
1. Copies of handouts

Mission Specific
If this module is being presented to prepare participants for a particular UN peacekeeping mission, then gather mission specific information from ITS Community of Practice platform (cop.dfs.un.org), or the specific mission’s website http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/index.asp. Additional mission specific information is available at the UN DPKO Policy and Training internet website: http://peacekeepingresourcehub.unlb.org/PBPS/Pages/Public/Home.aspx

Symbols Legend

👉 Note to the Instructor (Some background information for consideration)

💬 Speaking Points (The main points to cover on the topic. Ideally the speaking points are presented in the instructor’s own words versus being read to participants)

ბ Mission Specific (A point where the session will benefit from mission specific information)

مثال Example (Stories that illustrate a point or key message)

❓ Sample questions (A list of potential questions to pose to participants)

📚 Handout (Indicates a handout is provided to participants at this point)

🎬 Film (A film that is recommended as a core part of the training or an option)

🇸.innerText Core Learning Activity (An activity that is strongly recommended for inclusion)

.Optional Learning Activity (An activity that can be used if there is time and it is appropriate for the participant group. Guidelines for these activities are provided at the end of the unit, section or part – as indicated in the text)

❗ Key summary points (Key messages that are worth repeating at the end of the session.)
Session Notes

Introduction

Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute

The Army's only organization for Peace and Stability Operations at the strategic and operational level

UN Peacekeeping Mission Unit 3/Part 2:
MDMP/MCPP Comparison
Classroom Instructional Briefing

Note to Instructor: Give the participants a brief explanation on why they should pay special attention to this module. Highlight the importance of understanding the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP). Refer to: Background in the Preparatory Notes to the Instructor.

Learning Objectives

Learning Objective

At the conclusions of the session, US trainers will:

- Understand the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP)
On completion of this module, US trainers will:

- Understand the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP).

**Agenda**

- References
- Purpose
- Comparison of MDMP & MCPP
  - Receive the Mission vs Guidance
  - Mission Analysis
  - COA Development
  - COA Analysis & Selection
  - Produce the Plan
- Summary/Conclusion

To accomplish this, participants will first review the references available, then walk through a comparison of MDMP and MCPP. Similarities and differences between “Receive the Mission” and “Guidance” will be addressed, as well as how “Mission Analysis” is accomplished. Key differences between COA Development, Analysis and Selection will be covered, as well as how the planning process addresses “producing the plan.”
References

- US Army Tactics, Techniques & Procedures (ATTP) 5-0.1 The Planning Process (SEP 2011)

References available include all references identified for MCPP in Unit 3, Part 1, as well as US references on the MDMP.

Comparison of MDMP and MCPP

The military decision making process (MDMP) is an iterative planning methodology that integrates the activities of the commander, staff, subordinate headquarters, and other partners to understand the situation and mission,
develop and compare courses of action (COAs), decide on a COA that best accomplishes the mission, and produce an operation plan or order for execution. The MDMP helps leaders apply thoroughness, clarity, sound judgment, logic, and professional knowledge to understand situations, develop options to solve problems, and reach decisions. The MDMP is a process that helps commanders, staffs, and others think critically and creatively while planning.

The US MDMP has considerable similarities to the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP). While the steps are designed and broken down differently, the same objective is achieved.

Lesson 3, Part 1 covered the five steps of the MCPP. MDMP has seven specific steps. As you can see from the slide, there is considerable similarity in the terms that are applied to the steps in MDMP and MCPP. The discussion today will center on similarities and differences between the steps of the process, as conducted by the US military and the UN military component.

**Receive the Mission versus Guidance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDMP</th>
<th>MCPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alert the staff &amp; other key participants</td>
<td>Collect DPKO Guidance Materials:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gather tools needed to conduct</td>
<td>• UNHQ Strategic/Operational</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mission analysis</td>
<td>• Technical Assessment Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Manuals</td>
<td>• Secretary General’s Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Documents related to mission &amp; OE</td>
<td>• Rules of Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intel assessments</td>
<td>• Integrated Strategic Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outside agency products</td>
<td>• Mission Concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Standing operating procedures</td>
<td>• CONOPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Running estimates</td>
<td>• HQMC Directive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design products</td>
<td>• Troop Contributing Country (TCC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Update running estimates</td>
<td>• Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conduct an initial assessment</td>
<td>• Input from other Programmes &amp; Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue the commander’s initial</td>
<td>• Study initial assessment of OE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guidance</td>
<td>• Prepare/update staff estimates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Issue a warning order (WARNO 1)</td>
<td>• Conduct quick time estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Issue initial warning order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“MCPP Guidance Step is more detailed

US Commanders initiate MDMP upon receipt or in anticipation of a mission. The purpose of this step is to alert all participants of the pending planning requirements, determine the amount of time available for planning and preparation, and decide on a planning approach, including guidance on design and how to abbreviate the MDMP, if required. “Staff gathers all relevant resources” is a bit simplistic when measured against all that is actually happening during this step.

When a new mission is identified, the staff and other key participants are alerted. The staff then prepares for mission analysis by gathering the tools they will...
needed to perform it. These tools include, but are not limited to: Appropriate field manuals (FMs); documents related to the mission and the area of operations, including the higher headquarters’ operation plan and operation order, maps and terrain products, and operational graphics; higher headquarters’ and other organizations’ intelligence and assessment products; estimates and products of other military and civilian agencies and both its own and the higher headquarters’ standing operating procedures; current running estimates; and any design products, including the design concept.

The staff will update any running estimates and conduct and initial assessment of time and resources available to plan, prepare and begin execution of an operations. This initial assessment helps the commander determine the time needed to plan and prepare for the mission; any required guidance on design and abbreviating the MDMP, if required; which outside agencies and organizations to contact and incorporate into the planning process; and the staff’s experience, cohesiveness, and level of rest or stress.

The chief of staff or executive officer will develop a staff planning timeline that outlines how long the headquarters can spend on each step of the MDMP. The staff planning timeline indicates what products are due, who is responsible for them, and who receives them.

The commander issues initial guidance, including Initial time allocations; decisions to initiate design or go directly into the MDMP; how to abbreviate the MDMP, if required; necessary coordination to perform, including liaison officers to exchange; authorized movements and any reconnaissance and surveillance to initiate; collaborative planning times and locations; initial information requirements; and additional staff tasks.

Finally, a warning order (WARNO #1) is issued including (at a minimum) the type of operation, the general location of the operation, the initial timeline, and any movement or reconnaissance to initiate.

*The instructor could pose questions to participants to get their understanding of how “receive the mission” in MDMP differs from “guidance” in MCPP.*
Mission Analysis

The MDMP continues with an assessment of the situation called mission analysis. Commanders (supported by their staffs and informed by subordinate and adjacent commanders and by other partners) gather, analyze, and synthesize information to orient themselves on the current conditions of the operational environment. The commander and staff conduct mission analysis to better understand the situation and problem, and identify what the command must accomplish, when and where it must be done, and most importantly why—the purpose of the operation.

Since no amount of subsequent planning can solve an insufficiently understood problem, mission analysis is the most important step in the MDMP. This understanding of the situation and the problem allows commanders to visualize and describe how the operation may unfold in their initial commander’s intent and planning guidance. During mission analysis, the commander and staff perform the process actions shown here.

Outputs from this step include an approved problem statement and approved mission statement; initial commander’s intent; initial CCIRs and EEFIs; initial commander’s planning guidance; information themes and messages; updated IPB products; updated running estimates; assumptions; resource shortfalls; updated operational timeline; COA evaluation criteria and a warning order.

At the conclusion of Mission Analysis, essentially the two processes have covered the same amount of ground and resulted in like products.

The instructor could pose questions to participants to get their understanding of how they would need to adjust their thinking to adapt to mission planning in MCPP.
During COA development, planners use the problem statement, mission statement, commander's intent, planning guidance, and various knowledge products developed during mission analysis to develop a broad potential solution to an identified problem. The COA development step for both MDMP and MCPP, which generates options for follow-on analysis and comparison that satisfy the commander's intent and planning guidance, are very similar.

**COA Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MDMP</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Approved problem statement</td>
<td>1. Assess relative combat power</td>
<td>1. CDR's selected COA for war-gaming with COA statements &amp; sketches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Approved mission statement</td>
<td>2. Generate options</td>
<td>2. CDR's refined planning guidance, to include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Initial CDR's intent &amp; planning guidance</td>
<td>3. Army forces</td>
<td>- War-gaming guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Design concept</td>
<td>4. Develop a broad concept</td>
<td>- Evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCPP</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Staff Estimates</td>
<td>2. Analyze Centre of Gravity</td>
<td>2. COA Development Brief</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MDMP/MCPP COA Development are very similar*

**COA Analysis and Selection**

**MDMP** (Conducted in 3 Separate Steps)
- COA Analysis & war-gaming – conducted against enemy COAs
- COA Comparison - Each COA compared based on the same criteria
- COA Approval - Staff recommends COA in decision brief; CDR decides on best COA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MCPP</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conflict parties' COA</td>
<td>1. Conduct COA testing (war-gaming)</td>
<td>1. COA testing results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>COA statements/sketches</td>
<td>2. Conduct COA evaluation &amp; comparison</td>
<td>2. Task organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Staff estimates</td>
<td>3. CCIR</td>
<td>3. CCIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>List of critical events</td>
<td>5. Decision brief</td>
<td>5. Decision brief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>ROE</td>
<td>7. Warning Order No.3</td>
<td>7. Warning Order No.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COA analysis enables commanders and staffs to identify difficulties or coordination problems as well as probable consequences of planned actions for each COA being considered. It helps them think through the tentative plan. COA analysis not only appraises the quality of each COA but also uncovers potential execution problems, decisions, and contingencies. MCPP COA Analysis and Selection combines the 3 MDMP steps of COA Analysis & War-gaming, COA Comparison and COA Approval into one step.

MCPP COA Analysis and Selection includes War-gaming, which is a disciplined process, with rules and steps that attempt to visualize the flow of the operation, given the force's strengths and dispositions, enemy's capabilities and possible COAs, impact and requirements of civilians in the AO, and other aspects of the situation.

Like MDMP, MCPP includes analysis of COAs through comparison of their individual advantages and disadvantages. It is merely a sub step of Analysis and Selection rather than being a separate and discrete step as in MDMP. Ultimately, both processes result in a COA Decision brief, presented to the Commander, who will accept, modify or reject the COAs.

The instructor could pose questions to participants to get their views on whether combining the 3 MDMP steps of COA Analysis & War-gaming, COA Comparison and COA Approval into one step would have a significant impact on the outcome.

**Produce the Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THE UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produce the Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MDMP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 Paragraph operations order with annexes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rehearsal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCPP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 5 Paragraph operations order</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*MCPP Does not address Rehearsal

In both MCPP and MDMP, the staff prepares the order or plan by turning the selected COA into a clear, concise concept of operations and the required supporting information. The COA statement becomes the concept of operations.
for the plan. The COA sketch becomes the basis for the operation overlay. If time permits, the staff may conduct a more detailed war game of the selected COA to more fully synchronize the operation and complete the plan.

Unlike in MCPP, where Producing the Plan is the definitive aspect of the process, MDMP includes provisions for Rehearsals.

Overall, while the steps are constructed slightly differently, MDMP and MCPP both help leaders apply thoroughness, clarity, sound judgment, logic, and professional knowledge to understand situations, develop options to solve problems, and reach decisions. These defined processes help commanders, staffs, and others think critically and creatively while planning.

**Learning Objectives**

At the conclusions of the session, US trainers will:

- Understand the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP)

Training conducted today was designed so US trainers will understand the similarities and differences between the US Military Decision Making Process (MDMP) and the UN Military Component Planning Process (MCPP).
Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute

The Army's only organization for Peace and Stability Operations at the strategic and operational level

UN Peacekeeping Mission Unit 3/Part 2:
MDMP/MCPP Comparison
Classroom Instructional Briefing