


Joint Publication 3-24



Counterinsurgency



25 April 2018



PREFACE

1. Scope

This publication provides joint doctrine to plan, execute, and assess counterinsurgency operations.

2. Purpose

This publication has been prepared under the direction of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff (CJCS). It sets forth joint doctrine to govern the activities and performance of the Armed Forces of the United States in joint operations, and it provides considerations for military interaction with governmental and nongovernmental agencies, multinational forces, and other interorganizational partners. It provides military guidance for the exercise of authority by combatant commanders and other joint force commanders (JFCs), and prescribes joint doctrine for operations and training. It provides military guidance for use by the Armed Forces in preparing and executing their plans and orders. It is not the intent of this publication to restrict the authority of the JFC from organizing the force and executing the mission in a manner the JFC deems most appropriate to ensure unity of effort in the accomplishment of objectives.

3. Application

a. Joint doctrine established in this publication applies to the Joint Staff, commanders of combatant commands, subordinate unified commands, joint task forces, subordinate components of these commands, the Services, and combat support agencies.

b. The guidance in this publication is authoritative; as such, this doctrine will be followed except when, in the judgment of the commander, exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise. If conflicts arise between the contents of this publication and the contents of Service publications, this publication will take precedence unless the CJCS, normally in coordination with the other members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has provided more current and specific guidance. Commanders of forces operating as part of a multinational (alliance or coalition) military command should follow multinational doctrine and procedures ratified by the United States. For doctrine and procedures not ratified by the US, commanders should evaluate and follow the multinational command's doctrine and procedures, where applicable and consistent with US law, regulations, and doctrine.

For the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:



KEVIN D. SCOTT
Vice Admiral, USN
Director, Joint Force Development

Intentionally Blank

**SUMMARY OF CHANGES
REVISION OF JOINT PUBLICATION 3-24
DATED 22 NOVEMBER 2013**

- Deleted the paragraphs that cover operational assessment model and operational assessment steps due to redundancy with Joint Publication 5-0, *Joint Planning*.
- Replaced the term “generational engagement” with “generational approach” in order to better reflect long-term partnering as well as engagement.
- Replaced the phrase “counterinsurgency environment” with “operational environment.”
- Revised the term “violent extremist” to include “violent extremist organizations.”
- Revised the phrase “root causes of the insurgency” to “roots of the insurgency.”
- Updated paragraphs to delineate between information operations and military information support operations.
- Added a discussion on the roles of women in an insurgency, such as combatants, members of the auxiliary, and suicide bombers.
- Added more in-depth discussion on disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration and how it can be applied while an insurgency is ongoing and after an insurgency ends.
- Added discussion on criminal networks within counterinsurgency operations.

Intentionally Blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ix
CHAPTER I	
OVERVIEW	
• Introduction.....	I-1
• Approach to Counterinsurgency	I-3
• Governance and Legitimacy	I-6
• Insurgency and Counterinsurgency Narratives.....	I-8
CHAPTER II	
INSURGENCY	
• Overview.....	II-1
• Nature of Insurgency	II-2
• Conditions for Insurgency	II-4
• Insurgency Objectives and End State	II-10
• Insurgency Narrative and Strategy	II-12
• Insurgency Organization.....	II-16
• Stages and Outcomes of Insurgency.....	II-21
CHAPTER III	
COUNTERINSURGENCY	
• Overview.....	III-1
• Counterinsurgency Mindset.....	III-4
• Tenets of Counterinsurgency	III-7
• United States Government Activities	III-16
• Operational Approaches	III-21
• Roles and Responsibilities.....	III-22
• Command and Organizational Relationships	III-25
• Employment Considerations.....	III-28
• Conventional Forces Considerations	III-30
• Special Operations Considerations	III-31
• Force Protection Considerations.....	III-32
• Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration	III-33
• Economic and Infrastructure Development	III-35
CHAPTER IV	
THE OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENT	
• Introduction.....	IV-1
• Operational Environment in Counterinsurgency	IV-2
• Tools and Methods for Understanding the Operational Environment.....	IV-3

- Establish an Evolving Common Operational Picture IV-9
- Joint Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment for Counterinsurgency IV-10

CHAPTER V
PLANNING

- General V-1
- Additional Considerations for Counterinsurgency V-5
- Termination and Transitions V-10
- Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration Planning V-12
- Assessment Planning V-14

CHAPTER VI
ASSESSMENT

- Introduction to Assessing a Counterinsurgency Operation or Campaign VI-1
- Organizing for Assessment VI-4
- The Assessment Process and Assessment Plan VI-4
- Operation Assessment Methods VI-11

CHAPTER VII
COUNTERINSURGENCY OPERATIONS

- Section A. Execution VII-1
 - General VII-1
 - Support the Counterinsurgency Narrative VII-2
 - Distributed Operations VII-2
 - Command and Control VII-2
 - Rules of Engagement VII-3
 - Operational Methods for Counterinsurgency VII-3
 - Generational Approach VII-4
 - Network Engagement Activities VII-5
 - Shape, Clear, Hold, Build, and Transition VII-6
 - Identify, Separate, Influence, and Renunciation VII-10
 - Limited Support/Light Footprint VII-14
 - Combined Action VII-15
 - Targeting VII-16
 - Localized Security Activities VII-17
 - Fires and Joint Fire Support VII-19
 - Commander’s Communication Synchronization VII-19
- Section B. Supporting Operations and Activities VII-20
 - Civil-Military Operations and Teaming VII-20
 - Security Cooperation VII-26
 - Foreign Internal Defense VII-27
 - Counterterrorism Operations VII-28

- Electronic Warfare..... VII-29
- Cyberspace Operations VII-30
- Air Operations VII-30
- Space Operations VII-34
- Maritime Operations..... VII-34
- Detainee Operations..... VII-36
- Countering Threat Networks VII-37
- Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Activities VII-38
- Counter Threat Finance Activities..... VII-39
- Public Affairs..... VII-40
- Intelligence Support to Operations VII-42
- Identity Activities VII-42
- Violent Extremism..... VII-43

APPENDIX

- A Building Governance..... A-1
- B Authorities in Counterinsurgency Operations..... B-1
- C Counterinsurgency Practices C-1
- D Points of Contact D-1
- E References E-1
- F Administrative Instructions F-1

GLOSSARY

- Part I Abbreviations, Acronyms, and Initialisms GL-1
- Part II Terms and Definitions GL-5

FIGURE

- II-1 Insurgent Actions, Political and Military II-18
- IV-1 Potential Analytical Frameworks IV-6
- VI-1 Comparison and Use of Information and Intelligence VI-7
- VII-1 Transition Examples..... VII-11
- VII-2 Inform, Educate, Persuade, and Influence Integration VII-20
- VII-3 Counterinsurgency and Foreign Internal Defense
Interaction Scale VII-28

Intentionally Blank

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY COMMANDER'S OVERVIEW

- **Discusses approaches to counterinsurgency.**
 - **Describes the nature of an insurgency.**
 - **Discusses the tenets of counterinsurgency.**
 - **Provide considerations for counterinsurgency planning.**
 - **Describes the counterinsurgency operational environment.**
 - **Discusses aspects for the conduct of an assessment.**
-

Overview

Insurgency is the organized use of subversion and violence to seize, nullify, or challenge political control of a region.

Insurgency is the organized use of subversion and violence to seize, nullify, or challenge political control of a region. An insurgency is a form of intrastate conflict, and counterinsurgency (COIN) is used to counter it. The joint force commander (JFC) should understand insurgencies increasingly present threats to the joint force that are increasingly transregional, multi-domain, and multifunctional.

The US could get involved in a counterinsurgency (COIN) operation at the request of a partner nation or after a conflict whereby the US disestablishes the standing government of a threat nation.

The US could get involved in a COIN operation or campaign in two common ways. The first is at the request of a partner nation faced with an insurgency that it does not have the capacity to control. The second way is after a major conventional conflict whereby the US disestablishes the standing government of a threat nation and assumes the role of reestablishing a new government and security.

Insurgencies will continue to challenge security and stability around the globe.

Insurgencies will continue to challenge security and stability around the globe. Globalization, weak nation-state governments, changing demographics, radical ideologies, environmental changes, and economic pressures are exacerbated by the ease of communication and interaction within and among insurgent groups, terrorists, and criminals; all can put both weak and moderately governed nation-states at risk.

COIN is the combination of measures undertaken by a government, sometimes with United States Government (USG) and multinational partner support, to defeat an insurgency.

COIN is the combination of measures undertaken by a government, sometimes with United States Government (USG) and multinational partner support, to defeat an insurgency. An effective COIN operation will utilize all instruments of national power to integrate and synchronize political, security, legal, economic, development, and psychological activities carried out by the host nation (HN) and applicable USG and multinational partners to create a holistic approach aimed at weakening the insurgents while simultaneously bolstering the government's legitimacy in the eyes of the contested population.

Approach to COIN

COIN is coordinated by civilian government authorities and military forces. Successful COIN operations adapt to changes in the operational environment (OE) and the insurgent's strategy, operations, and tactics.

Task and activities in an OE with an insurgency often need to be carried out in dramatically different ways from one environment to the next.

The development of an effective COIN approach starts with the acceptance of the relevant population as key to a COIN operation.

In COIN operations, the JFC and interagency partners, in cooperation with the HN government, should simultaneously focus on the opportunity, the motive, and the means that serve as the basis for the insurgency. The perceptions and behavior of relevant actors (friendly, neutral, threat), especially those of the relevant populations, can influence all three of these factors.

Governance and Legitimacy

Governance is the ability to serve the population through the rules, processes, and behavior by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in a society.

All governments govern through a combination of consent, influence, and to some degree, coercion. The HN government generally needs some level of legitimacy among the population to retain the confidence of the populace and an acknowledgment of governing power.

Insurgency and COIN Narratives

Insurgents typically develop a strategic narrative as the central mechanism through which their ideologies,

policies, and strategies are combined. Insurgents often try to use the local narrative to gain popular support and recruits for their cause.

The COIN narrative informs internal and external audiences of the purpose of COIN operations, demonstrating consistency between word and action and providing a singular voice for friendly efforts, as well as providing a contrast to the insurgency narrative.

Insurgency

Overview

An insurgency normally begins before it is recognized by the governing authorities, allowing the insurgent leaders to organize and operate in a clandestine manner until it chooses to commit violence and subversion. US military operations, as well as the operations and efforts of other USG departments and agencies, all have led to an acknowledgment of an increasing nexus between insurgent groups, transnational criminal organizations, and transnational terrorist organizations. Also, the increasing influence of commercial, informational, financial, political, and ideological links between previously disparate parts of the world has created new dynamics that further shape insurgencies and other irregular forms of conflict.

Nature of Insurgency

Insurgent groups tend to adopt an irregular approach because they initially lack the resources required to directly confront the incumbent government in traditional warfare. Over time, insurgencies work to force governments to the negotiating table or grow until insurgent forces can directly confront and defeat the government security forces and seize control over the seat of government.

Insurgencies driven by commercial or criminal objectives are an exception. Rather, they focus on gaining political control of the country's leaders and security apparatus.

Conditions for Insurgency

The three conditions that must be present for an insurgency to develop are opportunity, motive, and means.

Opportunity alludes to the emergence of significant gaps in the ability of the national government or local allies to provide security for its territory and population.

There should be a compelling **motive** to organize an insurgency, because insurgents are generally treated as violent, traitorous criminals by the security forces, government authorities, and potentially some segments of the indigenous population.

For **means**, the leaders of emerging insurgencies will covertly establish systems that allow them to procure, assemble, and organize personnel, funds, weapons, secure communications, and logistics.

Insurgency Objectives and End State

Insurgents challenge the government in escalating violence, risking their lives until they succeed. Ideally, from the insurgent's perspective, the government succumbs to the pressure over time and the insurgents favorably negotiate an end.

Insurgency Narrative and Strategy

Insurgent groups harness narratives to communicate grievances, goals, and justifications for actions to both internal and external audiences. Insurgency narratives have three elements or components: actors and the environments in which they operate, events along a temporal continuum, and causality—cause and effect relative to the first two elements.

Insurgent strategies are composed of interdependent political and military dimensions. The relative emphasis on each of those aspects and exactly how they are linked is shaped by the combination of opportunity, motive, and means factors and the nature of the insurgent objectives.

Insurgency Organization

Insurgencies will develop and adapt their operational approaches and organizational structure to the current conditions of the OE. More specifically, insurgent organizational and operational approaches are directly related to the strength of the HN government.

Politically organized insurgencies develop a complex political structure before or at the same time they begin undertaking military operations against the government.

Militarily organized insurgencies calculate military success, and the resulting weakening of the government will cause the population to rally to the insurgents' cause.

Traditionally organized insurgencies draw on preexisting identities through tribal, clan, ethnic, or religious affiliations.

Cellular-organized insurgencies develop and are centered in urban areas and lack hierarchical political and military leadership structures, instead organizing around small, semiautonomous cells. Their cellular structure and reliance on terrorism can limit their ability to mobilize popular support.

Stages and Outcomes of Insurgency

The stages of insurgency are pre-conflict stage, inception, open conflict, and resolution. Outcomes of insurgency may be an insurgent victory, a negotiated settlement, or a government victory.

Counterinsurgency

Overview

COIN is the blend of comprehensive civilian and military efforts designed to simultaneously defeat and contain insurgency and address its root causes. Some of the key objectives of COIN operations are to reduce violence, address core grievances, and enable the HN government to exercise political control over its population territory via a system of legitimate governance. Therefore, COIN is fundamentally an armed political competition between a government and its partners and insurgents and their supporters.

COIN Mindset

COIN is distinguished from traditional warfare due to the focus of its operations—a relevant population—and its strategic purpose—to gain or maintain control or influence over—and the support of that relevant population through political, psychological, and economic methods. Warfare that has the population as its focus of operations requires a different mindset and different capabilities than warfare that focuses on defeating a threat militarily. In COIN operations, this means an adaptive and flexible mindset to understand the population, anticipate insurgent actions, be comfortable among the population, and appreciate the comprehensive approach of unified action.

Core of COIN

The core of COIN is the political strategy, which should articulate how the HN will address the root causes (opportunity, motives, and means) that drive the insurgency. The strategy provides a framework around which all other programs and activities are organized.

Tenets of COIN

The operational tenets of COIN are to provide guideposts for the joint force. These tenets complement the principles of joint operations and provide focus on how to successfully conduct COIN. The tenets of COIN are further supported by the tactical precepts of COIN. The tenets of COIN include understand the OE, develop the COIN narrative, primacy of politics, population security, and unity of command and unity of effort.

USG Activities

The context for US involvement in COIN is based on three possible strategic settings: assisting an established HN government, as an adjunct to US major combat operations, or US operations in an ungoverned area. USG involvement can take the form of indirect support, direct support without combat operations, or US combat operations.

Political Considerations

As important as unity of command is to military operations, it is one of the most sensitive and difficult to resolve issues in COIN. Nations join multinational forces for various reasons. Although the missions of multinational partners may appear similar to those of the US, the rules of engagement (ROE), home-country policies, and sensitivities may differ among partners. Military leaders should have a strong cultural and political awareness of US, HN, and other multinational military partners.

Force Protection Considerations

Force protection is a constant requirement, and priority, in every operation. Rigid force protection measures may alienate the COIN force from the population.

Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration (DDR)

Disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) is the process of standing down parties to an armed conflict and the reintegration of ex-combatants into civilian life. It seeks to address the post-conflict security challenge that arises from ex-combatants being left without livelihoods or support networks during such critical transition periods.

DDR attempts to stabilize the OE by disarming and demobilizing insurgents during the insurgency and by helping return former insurgents to civilian life.

Economic and Infrastructure Development

Economic and infrastructure development have been frequently featured as a key line of effort (LOE) in recent COIN operations. Counterinsurgents should avoid relying on infrastructure outputs as metrics in themselves. Instead, metrics should capture how economic and infrastructure development affect political and social attitudes. Counterinsurgents should aim to ensure short-term stabilization measures do not undercut long-term development goals.

The Operational Environment

Introduction

An understanding of the OE enables the development of a COIN approach that includes realistic, achievable objectives and properly aligns ends, ways, and means. Understanding of the OE is accomplished through tailoring joint intelligence preparation of the operational environment (JIPOE) and assessment requirements for COIN. The COIN OE encompasses the relevant actors and the physical areas and sociocultural and other factors throughout the entire OE.

Tools and Methods for Understanding the Operational Environment

Many tools and methodologies have been developed that are worthy of consideration by the JFC for understanding the OE for a COIN operation. These include intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, sociocultural analysis, analytical frameworks, social network analysis, social science, information management and information technology, and identity activities.

Establish an Evolving Common Operational Picture

Due to the distributed nature inherent in COIN, the COIN common operational picture is an identical set of information/data shared by more than one command. Without a shared situational awareness of relevant aspects of the OE by members of the joint force, civilian agencies, and multinational partners, separate entities within the COIN force will likely analyze problems differently, leading to uncoordinated attempts at solutions that may undermine if not conflict with one another.

Joint Intelligence Preparation of the

In many operations, the defeat of the enemy's military capabilities is the main focus of JIPOE. COIN, however, is focused on the threat (insurgents, terrorists, criminals,

Operational Environment for COIN

and their direct support), indigenous population (often representing the neutral network), and friendly forces (part of the friendly network) in the context of mitigating conditions that are driving or enabling a continuing insurgency.

Planning

Planning, Coordination, and Implementation

All USG COIN strategies, plans, programs, and activities that are undertaken to support an HN government are managed through the elements of the US country team, led by the chief of mission. Commanders create coordinating mechanisms, such as committees or liaison elements, to facilitate cooperation and build trust with HN authorities. Coordinate and support down to the village and neighborhood level. Authority will be transferred to an HN when either a government in exile or new government is ready.

Additional Considerations for COIN

There are several operations, programs, and activities that may be conducted as a part of or concurrently with COIN.

- Negotiation and Mediation. Negotiating from a position of strength for leaders conducting COIN is critical.
- Security Cooperation. These efforts can help minimize the effects of or prevent insurgencies and thwart their regeneration.
- Foreign Internal Defense (FID). The focus of all US FID efforts is to support the HN's internal defense and development program.
- Combating Terrorism. Actions taken directly against terrorist networks and indirectly to influence and render global and regional environments inhospitable to terrorist networks.
- Counterinsurgency Operations. Operations and activities conducted by armed forces, paramilitary forces, or nonmilitary agencies of a government against guerrillas.
- Stability Activities. Activities rooted in the political nature of the conflict. The primary focus should be the population, rather than the insurgents.
- Peace Operations. Includes peacekeeping operations, peace enforcement operations, peace building post-conflict actions, peacemaking processes, and conflict prevention.

Termination and Transitions

A COIN operation will eventually reach a conclusion, as an insurgent victory, a negotiated settlement, or an HN government victory. The termination of US combat operations can also precede any of those events. If established, the transitional military authority will eventually relinquish control of the OE, with activities assumed by the HN or another authority. Political reform should be started as soon as feasible, even if the insurgency is still ongoing.

DDR Planning

Planning for a successful DDR requires an understanding of both the situation on the ground and the objectives, political will, and resources with which other relevant actors and donor organizations are willing to support. Ideally, governmental organizations and nongovernmental organizations from the international community collaborate with the HN government to plan and execute DDR. Joint forces should be integrated in the planning of DDR from its inception.

Assessment

Operation Assessment

In general, assessments should answer two questions: Is the JFC doing things right? Is the JFC doing the right things? In COIN operations, it is difficult to isolate the effects of specific actions. The commander and staff focus information requirements to answer specific questions about the operation plan.

Assessment Complexities in COIN

Operation assessments in COIN differ from assessments of many traditional operations because success of the operation often relies on nonmilitary factors and factors outside of the joint force's direct control. This increases the focus on diplomatic, informational, and economic objectives.

Organizing for Assessment

Assessments are commander-centric and require integration and feedback mechanisms within the organizational battle rhythms to inform decisions and necessary shifts in the operational plan.

Operation Assessment Methods

Contextual assessments capitalize on the decentralized nature of COIN operations to build assessment from the bottom up. Commanders at each echelon determine what is important to help them describe progress.

Stage-based assessment plan uses sets of basic criteria to establish a common framework, with an emphasis on identifying key issues and potential means of addressing them.

Counterinsurgency Operations

Execution

COIN operations require synchronized application of military, paramilitary, diplomatic, political, economic, law enforcement, psychological, and civic actions. The political issues at stake are often rooted in culture, ideology, societal tensions, and injustice. As such, they defy nonviolent solutions available through the ordinary course of governance. Joint forces can compel obedience and secure areas; however, they cannot by themselves achieve the political settlement needed to resolve the situation. Effective approaches to COIN include civilian agencies, US military forces, and multinational forces. COIN supports local institutions and their ability to enable good governance. These efforts purposefully attack the root causes of the insurgency rather than just its fighters and comprehensively address the associated core grievances. HN leaders should be purposefully involved in this effort and ultimately should take lead responsibility for it.

Support the COIN Narrative

Operations/activities that fail to incorporate the COIN narrative will do greater harm more quickly than almost any deliberate action. Operations appropriately aligned with a narrative are strengthened through sense of purpose, unity of effort, and the ability to gain and maintain initiative against insurgents. The COIN narrative is most effective when recognized and respected across the COIN force and emboldened by everything counterinsurgents say and do.

Distributed Operations

COIN operations often require units, sometimes widely distributed and beyond mutually supporting range of each other, to conduct nonlinear activities/operations often in small, noncontiguous operational areas within the joint operations area. These distributed operations allow counterinsurgents to respond to all forms of insurgent activities, often simultaneously, and across a large area.

Rules of Engagement

The goal in formulating ROE is to ensure they allow maximum flexibility for mission accomplishment while

providing clear, unambiguous guidance to the forces affected. Standing ROE are fundamentally permissive in that a commander may use any lawful weapon or tactic available for mission accomplishment unless specifically restricted. All ROE should comply with the law of war.

Operational Methods for COIN

There are several options to consider when conducting COIN operations: generational approach; network engagement; shape, clear, hold, build, and transition; identify, separate, influence, and renunciation; limited support/light footprint; partnering; and combined action. Each option offers a different but complementary avenue and must be weighed against the OE. Each option can be used individually or in conjunction with the others. Negotiation and mediation and counterinsurgency operations are other methods to counter an insurgency.

Commander's Communication Synchronization

The commander's communication synchronization (CCS) is the JFC's process to coordinate and synchronize themes, messages, images, operations, and actions to with all instruments of national power in order to create, strengthen, or preserve conditions USG interests and objectives. CCS ensures the integrity and consistency of themes and messages to the lowest tactical level through the integration and synchronization of communication with operational activities.

Civil-Military Operations and Teaming

The integration of the instruments of national power in COIN frequently exposes military forces to a wider range of civil-dimension skills and capabilities than those military forces typically train for or inherently possess. As a result, coordination and collaboration become more important as the JFC seeks to gain unity of effort.

Security Cooperation

Security cooperation involves all Department of Defense interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific US security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide US forces with peacetime and contingency access to an HN. These activities help the US and HN gain credibility and help the HN build legitimacy.

Foreign Internal Defense

FID is the participation by civilian and military agencies of a government in any of the action programs taken by another government or other designated organization to

free and protect its society from subversion, lawlessness, insurgency, terrorism, and other threats to its security.

Counterterrorism Operations

An insurgent normally applies military power against military forces; a terrorist unlawfully uses violence against civilians. Elements of an insurgency often use terrorism as a means to influence local, domestic, and international audiences. Thus, a JFC may be simultaneously conducting COIN operations and counterterrorism.

Cyberspace Operations

The increasing reliance on cyberspace technology as a means of disseminating messages by the insurgents has provided an LOE joint forces can use to attack insurgents.

Detainee Operations

How counterinsurgents treat captured insurgents has immense potential impact on insurgent morale, retention, and recruitment. Humane and just treatment may afford counterinsurgents many short-term opportunities, as well as potentially damaging insurgent recruitment.

Countering Threat Networks

The purpose of countering threat networks activities is to shape the OE, deter aggression, provide freedom of movement, and defeat threat networks when necessary.

Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Activities

Countering improvised explosive devices requires both removing threat anonymity and the improvement of tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) and equipment through exploitation of the devices and analysis of blast effects.

Counter Threat Finance Activities

Counter threat finance activities deny, disrupt, destroy, or defeat the generation, storage, movement, and use of assets to fund activities that support a threat's ability to negatively affect US interests.

Public Affairs

The counterinsurgents' public affairs should always avoid negatively impacting the perception of neutral, independent, and impartial humanitarian participants.

Identity Activities

Identity activities enablers include a dedicated information-sharing architecture with access to national-level biometrics, forensics, document and media exploitation, and derogatory reporting databases; expeditionary exploitation facilities; and TTP for individual encounters, site exploitation, and evidentiary handling, as well as training on fielded collection devices.

Violent Extremism

Violent extremism (VE) refers to advocating, engaging in, preparing, or otherwise supporting ideologically motivated or justified violence to further social, economic, and political objectives. While VE and insurgency share many of the same core grievances, they differ in their degree of organizational support base and use of violence.

Conclusion

This publication provides doctrine for joint COIN.

Intentionally Blank

CHAPTER I OVERVIEW

“[The] United States will emphasize nonmilitary means and military-to-military cooperation to address instability and reduce the demand for significant US force commitments to stability operations. US forces will nevertheless be ready to conduct limited counterinsurgency and other stability operations if required, operating alongside coalition forces whenever possible. Accordingly, US forces will retain and continue to refine the lessons learned, expertise, and specialized capabilities that have been developed over the past ten years of counterinsurgency and stability operations in Iraq and Afghanistan.”

**Secretary of Defense Leon J. Panetta
Sustaining US Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense,
January 2012**

1. Introduction

a. Insurgency is the organized use of subversion and violence to seize, nullify, or challenge political control of a region. An insurgency is a form of intrastate conflict, and counterinsurgency (COIN) is used to counter it. The term insurgency can also refer to the group itself. Insurgents can combine the use of terrorism; subversion; sabotage; other political, economic, and psychological activities; and armed conflict to achieve its aims. It is an organization political-military struggle by a predominantly indigenous group or movement designed to weaken, subvert, or displace the control of an established government for a particular region. Each insurgency has its own unique characteristics, but they typically include the following common elements: a strategy, an ideology, an organization, a support structure, the ability to manage information, and a supportive environment. These characteristics present a significant threat to the existing government. Insurgents will typically solicit, or be offered, external support or sanctuary from state or non-state actors. The US could get involved in a COIN operation or campaign in two common ways. The first is at the request of a partner nation (PN) faced with an insurgency it does not have the capacity to control. The second way is after a major conventional conflict whereby the US disestablishes the standing government of a threat nation and assumes the role of reestablishing a new government and security. In this case, the joint force commander (JFC) should prepare for an insurgency from disgruntled former regime members. Both state and non-state actors are likely to confront the US during COIN operations due to their self-interests, ideology, territorial holding, or the area over which they can project influence or military power. In addition to insurgents, an insurgency may include anarchist extremists, local and transnational terrorists, local and transnational criminal organizations, and other radical fringe groups. Ultimately, the JFC should understand insurgencies increasingly present threats to the joint force that are increasingly transregional, multi-domain, and multifunctional (TMM).

b. Insurgencies will continue to challenge security and stability around the globe. Globalization, weak nation-state governments, changing demographics, radical ideologies, environmental changes, and economic pressures are exacerbated by the ease of communication and interaction within and among insurgent groups, terrorists, and

criminals; all can put both weak and moderately governed nation-states at risk. A failing nation-state can quickly become a disaster for its local population and a threat to both global stability and US interests.

c. Long-standing external and internal tensions tend to create or exacerbate core grievances of a segment of a population, which can result in political strife and instability. These grievances can be exploited by some groups to gain political advantage. Some transnational criminals or terrorists with radical political and religious ideologies may intrude in weak or poorly governed states to form a wider, more networked threat.

d. The United States Government (USG) supports allies and PNs to prevent or disrupt threats to their stability and security through foreign assistance and security cooperation (SC) activities. SC activities, which includes security assistance (SA), are conducted as part of geographic combatant commanders' (GCCs') theater campaign plans, often in conjunction with other USG stabilization efforts. The Department of Defense (DOD) may conduct SC activities in conjunction with a crisis response or contingency plan involving a PN in a limited contingency, such as a counterterrorism (CT) operation or foreign internal defense (FID) program supported by stability actions.

e. The FID program is an important USG tool to fight insurgencies. If a friendly nation appears vulnerable to an insurgency, and it is in the best interest of the USG to help it mitigate that insurgency, the USG can support the affected host nation's (HN's) internal defense and development (IDAD) strategy and program through FID efforts. When a HN government supported by a FID program appears to be overwhelmed by internal threats, and if it is in the national security interests of the USG, the President may initiate combat operations in the form of COIN operations, either in conjunction with the HN forces or in place of them, until the HN has the necessary capability and capacity to take on combat operations. Ultimately, the HN will retain responsibility for countering the insurgency even though US forces may be conducting COIN operations.

f. **COIN** is the combination of measures undertaken by a government, sometimes with USG and multinational partner support, to defeat an insurgency. An effective COIN operation will utilize all instruments of national power to integrate and synchronize political, security, legal, economic, development, and psychological activities carried out by the HN and applicable USG and multinational partners to create a holistic approach aimed at weakening the insurgents while simultaneously bolstering the government's legitimacy in the eyes of the contested population. Unity of effort is required to successfully conduct COIN operations and should integrate efforts of the HN, USG, and applicable multinational partners. The HN government, in coordination with the chief of mission (COM) or chargé d'affaires and JFC, should lead COIN. When the security risk in the operational environment (OE) is not conducive to a civilian agency lead for COIN within a specific area, the JFC may lead the COIN operation. A diplomatic mission is led by a COM, usually the ambassador, but may be a person designated by the President, or the charge d'affaires when no US ambassador is accredited to the country or the ambassador is absent from the country.

2. Approach to Counterinsurgency

COIN is coordinated by civilian government authorities and military forces. Success in COIN can be more complex than in other operations. One measure of success may be if US national objectives are met with little or no direct involvement on behalf of the HN. Other long-term measures may be associated with alleviating internal state grievances that initially led to an insurgency that could lead to future insurgencies. Another potential success measure addresses the establishment of stability that allows for the adequate functioning of political, social, and economic activities. Stability success measures may be viewed differently by the HN and USG. US participation in COIN operations is typically led by a COM, in conjunction with a JFC, and requires significant interagency coordination in the application of the instruments of national power. COIN operations will take time. Successful COIN operations adapt to changes in the OE and the insurgent's strategy, operations, and tactics. The joint force needs to adapt approaches based on the following considerations:

a. **COIN Strategy.** The COIN strategy is based on an integrated USG and HN strategy to retain political influence and legitimacy. It is designed to simultaneously protect the population from insurgent violence; increase the perception of HN government legitimacy by the populace; strengthen the capacity of the HN government; and isolate the insurgents physically, psychologically, politically, socially, and economically. All efforts are pursued for the purpose of addressing the perceived and actual political imbalance the insurgent leadership has exploited. The USG never intends to conduct COIN with an HN government indefinitely, but rather desires to responsibly end its COIN operation as soon as feasible by helping the HN government create sustainable security and stability. HN will often require USG support to sustain COIN successes. This support may last many years.

(1) **Political Power.** Insurgency is a struggle for some form of political power, which is nearly always the end, not the way or means, of the insurgent's strategy and tactics. The basis for an insurgency is typically the nexus of opportunity, motive, and means. A JFC should not confuse the various ways and means used by insurgents with the end or goal of their struggle. The methods used by the insurgent to gain political power can be a mix of soft coercion or raw intimidation and violence. At least some portion of a contested population will support an insurgency because the leadership of the insurgency will have spun a compelling narrative or capitalized on a compelling grievance that the HN government or supporting country are collectively responsible for their miseries. Narratives are complex and may draw upon a mix of ideology, identity, history, and religion. When that narrative is tied to actual persecution, disenfranchisement, or other core grievances related to a particular ethnic, religious, sectarian, or regional group, it is socially and politically powerful. US forces should encourage the HN to address the underlying causes of these grievances and violence. US forces should encourage the HN to promote, or at least consider, positive change to regain legitimacy where it has been lost and reestablish stability and not merely to undermine the insurgency narrative and gain the initiative. Influential members of the HN government, however, may see that type of consideration as an admission of fault or weakness and resist such a compromise. This is often the major challenge that the US will face with assisting an HN.

(2) **Political Control.** COIN requires a HN political strategy that establishes, reinforces, and sustains the control, legitimacy, and effectiveness of its government while reducing that of the insurgency. The USG may exercise many forms of national power in support of the HN, which are often just as important to COIN as the JFC's ability to apply lethal force.

(a) The JFC and COM efforts to strengthen the legitimacy of the HN government are enabled by understanding and continuously assessing the nature of the conflict and then tailoring resources and capabilities as necessary to facilitate the HN government providing a **secure, predictable, and acceptable** living environment for the population the HN government seeks to govern. This often requires the use of military and police force. JFCs should consider the use of nonlethal weapons (e.g., acoustic/optical devices, blunt impact munitions, vehicle/vessel stoppers) to fill the gap between verbal warnings and deadly force when dealing with unarmed hostile elements to avoid escalating the level of violence.

(b) The USG's overall intent is to only use the amount of force necessary to achieve strategic objectives. At times, however, the COIN forces will have no alternative except the use of force to reduce insurgent strength or influence, provide security to the populace, and compel compliance with applicable law or lawful orders.

(c) Due to sociocultural factors, USG focus should not be to transform the HN government into a mirror image of a Western-style democracy. Although some democratic principles are universal and may be valuable in establishing a base level of HN government legitimacy, the HN customs and laws should take precedence. However, US statutes mandate HN adherence to certain human rights standards as a prerequisite for US foreign assistance.

b. Understanding the OE

(1) **Define the OE.** The OE is the composite of the conditions, circumstances, and influences that affect the employment of capabilities and bear on the decisions of the commander. The OE is uncertain, complex, and rapidly changing. The OE and the threats it presents are TMM in nature. TMM threats will cut across multiple combatant commands (CCMDs) and areas of responsibility (AORs). The OE is ever fluid, with changing alliances, partnerships, and national and transnational threats that rapidly emerge, disaggregate, and reemerge. These factors will significantly affect how the JFC conducts COIN. Understanding the OE involves understanding the relevant actors, the physical domains, and the information environment. It requires a holistic view of friendly, neutral, and threat political, military, economic, social, information, and infrastructure (PMESII) systems. Understanding the OE requires understanding the decision making, mental disposition, and behavior of relevant actors, especially the public opinion of the relevant populations. Their natures and interactions will affect how the JFC plans, organizes for, conducts, and assesses COIN operations. Understanding the OE requires a continuous understanding of the dynamics of the insurgency, its effects on the population, the insurgents, history of interaction between population groups or history of interaction between population groups and the HN government, and the counterinsurgents. Given the

success of an insurgent often depends upon the support of the local population, commanders should pay particular concern to that aspect of the OE. The JFC should analyze not only how the insurgents think but also how the local population thinks. The JFC objectively analyzes the effect of all the activities undertaken by the joint force and its interagency and multinational partners on local perceptions and determine whether those activities support the COIN narrative or whether they inadvertently feed into the insurgency narrative.

Refer to Chapter IV, “The Operational Environment,” for a full discussion of the OE.

(2) **The COIN OE.** Task and activities in an OE with an insurgency often need to be carried out in dramatically different ways from one environment to the next, generally requiring specialized training and development of new capabilities or modifications to existing ones. The targeted application of security, diplomatic, development, and information resources during COIN operations is typically fraught with the risk of unintended consequences and requires a sophisticated understanding of sociocultural factors in the local context. Integration of resources and capabilities will likely need to be tailored for the purposes of stabilization, normally with coordination between the JFC and the COM. For military forces, COIN operations often involve a different set of tasks and capabilities than those required in traditional warfare. Similarly, interagency initiatives during COIN operations often differ in important respects from traditional diplomacy and development. Conventional forces that are optimized for major combat operations will usually require specific training, in particular on how they interact with diplomacy and development actors and perhaps even structural reorganization to meet the unique requirements of COIN operations.

(3) **COIN within the Relevant Population.** The development of an effective COIN approach starts with the acceptance of the relevant population as key to a COIN operation. Early on, host-nation security forces (HNSF) may be fully capable of providing a secure environment for the population, but that security and the ensuing trust in the HN government may erode as an insurgency makes gains over time. The commander should not assume the population is always the center of gravity (COG) in COIN, but neither should it be taken for granted, as the population will typically become a primary factor in the success or failure of the insurgency. The COG could range from a major external relevant actor to a popular core leadership. Success in COIN depends on the counterinsurgents’ ability to motivate various people, sometimes referred to herein as actors, toward behavior that supports an outcome of the operation consistent with the HN and USG’s desired end state. In traditional warfare, success is achieved primarily by destroying the enemy’s means to sustain military operations and occupying its territory. In COIN, the defeat of the insurgency’s military capabilities is just one component of what is ultimately a broader struggle to reestablish control by the HN government. Gaining this control, while also preserving the perception of legitimacy by the HN populace, requires a disciplined and balanced application of force. The use of lethal weapons may not be the most effective means of achieving JFC’s objectives. Use of nonlethal weapons can limit casualties and collateral damage. The cumulative effects created by all COIN activities should enable either ambivalence toward the insurgency or greater affiliation or allegiance

of the population and other actors to the HN government rather than support for the insurgency. This behavior in turn substantiates HN government legitimacy.

(4) **Assessing Relevant Actors.** Traditional warfare tends to focus primarily on the threat's means, especially military and technological capacity. In COIN operations, the JFC and interagency partners, in cooperation with the HN government, should simultaneously focus on the opportunity, motive, and means that serve as the basis for the insurgency. The perceptions and behavior of relevant actors (friendly, neutral, threat), especially those of the relevant populations, can influence all three of these factors. Relevant actors include individuals, groups, and populations whose behavior has the potential to substantially help or hinder the success of a campaign, operation, or tactical action. In COIN, the relevant actors always include the insurgents, the indigenous population, HNSF, and the HN government. Other relevant actors may include, depending on the particular situation, religious or social figures or organizations, governments at the sub-national level, non-state armed groups, media and business figures, and diaspora communities. Some actors may be adversarial to the HN government and/or US but not pose a direct military or security threat. For these actors, the primary threat is willing support to the insurgency. Actors are dynamic and may belong to more than one category at the same time or move from one category to another over time. As the OE and political conditions change, some actors may shift their allegiances to protect or pursue their own interests. COIN requires continuous assessment of the relevant actors, both directly and indirectly, to maintain an objective understanding of their opinions and strengths of their affiliations and allegiance.

Refer to Chapter II, "Insurgency," for discussion regarding opportunity, motive, and means as the basis for insurgency.

3. Governance and Legitimacy

a. **Governance.** Governance is the ability to serve the population through the rules, processes, and behavior by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in a society. A state's ability to provide effective governance rests on its political and bureaucratic willingness, capability, and capacity to establish rules and procedures for decision making, as well as its ability to provide public services in a manner that is predictable and acceptable to the local population. In an ungoverned area (UGA) or locally governed area, the state or the central government is unable or unwilling to extend control, effectively govern, or influence the local population. A UGA can also include an area where a provincial, local, tribal, or otherwise autonomous government does not fully or effectively govern. UGA is a broad term that encompasses under-governed, misgoverned, contested, and exploitable areas, characterized by the traits of inadequate governance capacity, insufficient political will, gaps in legitimacy, the presence or recent presence of conflict, or restrictive norms of behavior.

For more information regarding governance, refer to Joint Publication (JP) 3-07, Stability.

b. **Support to HN Government.** Successful COIN operations require an HN government that is capable and willing to counter the insurgency and address its root

causes. Typically, this involves a mix of political reform and improved governance. In some cases, targeted development initiatives might be necessary. COIN involves a careful balance between constructive dimensions (enhancing the capacity of the HN government to address the core grievances of the insurgency) and destructive dimensions (destroying and marginalizing the insurgency's political and military capabilities). In some situations, the USG may need to take the lead for the HN government, especially in the early stages of COIN. However, COIN activities should be transitioned back to an HN-led effort as soon as possible. This is especially true when the HN government may have suffered a crisis in legitimacy and governance, which will be bolstered by increased responsibilities, capabilities, and capacity. The political will of the HN government to carry out such activities is, therefore, critical.

c. **Legitimacy.** All governments govern through a combination of consent, influence, and to some degree, coercion. Legitimacy is a significant indicator of the extent to which systems of authority, decisions, and conduct are accepted by the local population. Political legitimacy of a government determines the degree to which the population will voluntarily comply with the decisions and rules issued by a governing authority. Governments described as legitimate primarily rule through the consent of the governed; those described as illegitimate tend to rely heavily on coercion. Citizens obey illegitimate governments because they fear retribution, rather than because they voluntarily accept its rule. While a legitimate government may employ limited coercion to enforce the law and ensure public order, most of its citizens voluntarily accept its authority. Legitimacy determines the transaction costs of political and governmental power: low legitimacy may breed contempt on the part of the population and may require extensive prodding and incentives or, in extreme cases, threats and intimidation by the government to secure compliance of the population; high legitimacy generally invites compliance by the population and therefore requires less effort by the government to ensure compliance. The latter normally fosters allegiance of the governed to the government, and legitimate governance is inherently more stable. The societal support it engenders allows it to adequately manage internal problems, change, and conflict.

(1) **Legitimacy in COIN.** The struggle for legitimacy with the relevant population is typically a central theme of the conflict between the insurgency and the HN government. The HN government generally needs some level of legitimacy among the population to retain the confidence of the populace and an acknowledgment of governing power. The insurgency will attack the legitimacy of the HN government while attempting to develop its own legitimacy with the population. COIN should reduce the credibility of the insurgency while strengthening the legitimacy of the HN government. During COIN operations, high legitimacy of the HN government magnifies the resources/capabilities of COIN (through such means as a populace willing to report on insurgents) and allows the HN to concentrate finite resources on targeting the insurgency. When dealing with insurgents, who are drawn from segments of the population, it is often a particular challenge for the HN to be seen as legitimate in public opinion. Legitimacy of the HN government can be undercut when an outside force like the USG supports the HN to aid in the fight against the insurgent.

(2) **Drivers of Legitimacy.** Legitimacy is achieved by the HN government through being perceived as effective and credible and by providing an environment for the population to maintain predictable and acceptable living conditions. In some situations, the provision of security and basic services may be enough for citizens to see a government as legitimate. Some elements of the population may only ask of their government that they be kept safe and left alone to live their lives with little interaction with the HN government. In other cases, the population may expect more extensive services from the HN government. **The key is that legitimacy is ultimately decided in the minds of the population.** Therefore, a key objective of COIN is to ensure the HN government meets the baseline expectations of the population to solidify its legitimacy.

(3) **Factors of Legitimacy.** The authority to govern is dependent upon the successful amalgamation and interplay of four factors: mandate, manner, consent, and expectations. When the relationship between the government and the governed breaks down, challenges to authority may result. If a significant section of the population, or just an extreme faction, believes it cannot achieve a remedy through established political processes, it may resort to insurgency.

(a) **Mandate.** The perceived legitimacy of the means that establishes a state authority, whether through the principles of universal suffrage, a recognized or accepted caste/tribal model, or authoritarian rule.

(b) **Manner.** The perceived legitimacy of the way in which those exercising that mandate conduct themselves, both individually and collectively, in meeting the expectations of the local population(s).

(c) **Consent.** The extent to which local populations consent to, or comply with, the manner and authority of those exercising the mandate. Consent may range from active support; passive support; or indifference, through begrudging compliance.

(d) **Expectations.** The extent to which those exercising the mandate manage or meet the expectations or aspirations of the elites, local populations, and international community. Expectations may depend upon the perceived quality or amount of support that the government delivers.

4. Insurgency and Counterinsurgency Narratives

Insurgents typically develop a strategic narrative as the central mechanism through which their ideologies, policies, and strategies are combined. The narrative can be used to shape attitudes and behaviors within the ranks of the insurgency and other relevant populations. The COIN narrative informs internal and external audiences of the purpose of COIN operations, demonstrating consistency between word and action and providing a singular voice for friendly efforts, as well as providing a contrast to the insurgency narrative. At the JFC level, supporting information activities are synchronized using the commander's communication synchronization (CCS) process and standard staff functions. At the operational and tactical levels, it is the consistency between word and action that

have the greatest impact on the population and, therefore, have the greatest probability of mitigating the impact of the insurgency's narrative on the population.

a. **Insurgency Narrative.** Narratives are central to activating and leveraging collective/group identities, particularly the collective identity of religious sects, ethnic groupings, and tribal elements. Insurgents often try to use the local narrative to gain popular support and recruits for their cause. They emphasize certain collective/group identity themes and selective interpretation of religious beliefs to contextualize local grievances as an element of the insurgent cause. Like terrorist groups, insurgents will exploit populations whose social narrative and norms are similar to, or can be manipulated by, the insurgent group. Stories about a community's history provide models of how actions and consequences are linked. Stories are often the basis for strategies and actions, as well as for interpreting others' intentions. Whenever possible, the USG should identify all insurgency narratives. US and HN leaders should then develop a shared understanding of the content, power, and effectiveness of the insurgency narrative(s).

b. **COIN Narrative.** COIN planners should compose a unifying message (the COIN narrative) that is consistent with the overarching USG narrative, which is coupled to the USG objective. Narrative is a structure of planned themes from which both messages and actions are developed. Narrative provides a common thread of communicative influence. The objective speaks to desired outcome; narrative communicates the story of the how and why of an operation. Common themes within a COIN narrative may be: reinforcing the credibility and perception of legitimacy of the HN and USG COIN operation, exploiting the negative aspects of the insurgent efforts, and preemptively presenting the expected insurgent argument along with counter-arguments. The COIN narrative is built on strategic themes that coincide with operational objectives. Messages and actions are planned to set the conditions for, or to reinforce, the COIN objective and narrative. In the end calculus, both operations and narrative should be mutually supporting and directed at the realization of the COIN operation's objectives. Narrative provides the guidance from which supporting themes are developed, followed by actions and messages. Source credibility is a planning consideration when implementing influence actions and messages consistent with the COIN narrative. Perceptions and bias in the information environment may decrease the source credibility of government forces or agencies. It is vital for counterinsurgents to assess, promote, and exploit the differences between accepted HN cultural norms and the insurgency narrative and associated adversary information efforts. The COIN narrative should be the result of meticulous target-audience analysis conducted by cultural and language subject matter experts and close collaboration among the HN government, GCC, and JFC. The COIN narrative should provide the guidance from which themes, actions, and messages can be planned in support of the COIN objectives. Finally, when faced with more than one significant insurgency narrative (e.g., those developed by indigenous insurgents, by transnational terrorists, and by a major criminal enterprise), more than one supporting COIN narrative may be required. Truthful, public communication aids in maintaining legitimacy through the rapid dissemination of accurate information.

For additional discussions about the insurgency narrative and COIN narrative, see Chapter II, “Insurgency,” and Chapter III, “Counterinsurgency.”

SRI LANKA AND THE TAMIL TIGERS

The requirement for legitimacy in the eyes of the population does not necessarily mean that the perception of legitimacy must be uniform throughout the entire territory. The government of Sri Lanka (GoSL) was able to effectively suppress and defeat a well-developed insurgency in the self-proclaimed Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) without any significant measure of legitimacy within the local Tamil population. However, it was able to do this because it enjoyed overwhelming popular support in its core region and the majority Sinhalese ethnic group.

Over the course of 30 years, armed with the legitimacy of the Tamil struggle for independence on the basis of the Thimpu principles (recognition of the Tamil people and the right to a separate homeland), the Tigers gained a reputation as one of the most sophisticated and deadly terrorist insurgencies in the world. The LTTE was able to take and hold large tracts of territory across northeast Sri Lanka, as well as resist and then decisively respond to concerted offensives instituted by the Sri Lankan Armed Forces. However, after a bitter campaign, the Sri Lankan Armed forces were able to eventually to drive Tamil leadership to accept terms for a ceasefire agreement in 2002. Nonetheless, repeated violations of the accord and fears that the group was exploiting the cessation of active combat to build up its own forces eventually led to the collapse of the agreement in mid-2006. Large-scale hostilities quickly resumed, which saw some of the bloodiest fighting of the more than three-decade war.

This time, however, with public opinion strongly against terrorism and new political leadership in Colombo from the rural class, the GoSL enjoyed widespread political support in suppressing the insurgency by whatever means necessary. This new leadership sought support for its war by providing development and poverty reduction programs in rural areas it controlled. Their recruitment swelled and their political leadership gained the necessary political will to confront the LTTE. At the same time, the GoSL did not seek to undermine the legitimacy of the LTTE in LTTE-control areas, but to isolate the group from outside support. With a concerted diplomatic push, international support for the LTTE faded as well, and military aid began to flow instead to the GoSL. With this support, the GoSL began adopting more aggressive and innovative military approaches, including maritime of LTTE supply lines and reliance on small unit tactics.

By 2009, the LTTE safe haven had been reduced to a small sliver of land where it made its last stand. Banning reporters from the region and reportedly ignoring the safety of Tamil civilians, the GoSL launched an all-out offensive, during which it killed or captured all remaining LTTE combatants and leadership.

Various Sources

CHAPTER II INSURGENCY

“Our tactics were always hit and run, not pushes, but strokes. We never tried to maintain or improve an advantage, but to move off and strike again somewhere else. We used the smallest force, in the quickest time, at the farthest place. If the action had continued till the enemy had changed his dispositions to resist it, we would have been breaking the spirit of our fundamental rule of denying him targets.”

T.E. Lawrence
“Evolution of a Revolt,” *Army Quarterly*, October 1920

1. Overview

a. An insurgency normally begins before it is recognized by the governing authorities, allowing the insurgent leaders to organize and operate in a clandestine manner until it chooses to commit violence and subversion. US military operations, as well as the operations and efforts of other USG departments and agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation, US Marshals Service, Drug Enforcement Agency, and US Immigration and Customs Enforcement, have all led to an acknowledgment of an increasing nexus between insurgent groups, transnational criminal organizations, and transnational terrorist organizations. These groups may be attracted to the insurgency or the insurgency may seek them out. In either case, the resulting relationship usually results in some type of support. Also, the increasing influence of commercial, informational, financial, political, and ideological links between previously disparate parts of the world has created new dynamics that further shape insurgencies and other irregular forms of conflict. The interaction of these TMM threats with local politics makes modern insurgencies distinct and complex challenges for HNs, multinational partners, and the USG, especially when using the military instrument of national power.

b. Two common objectives of insurgent movements are legitimacy according to public opinion and political control of a population in a particular geographic area. Unlike traditional warfare, nonmilitary means are often more effective in creating nonlethal effects enabling insurgents to gain that control, with guerrilla forces fulfilling security requirements and acting as enforcers for nonmilitary decision makers. When compared to the government, an insurgency generally has a strong will but different capabilities. This relative disparity of means normally drives groups to use insurgency to alleviate core grievances, especially some insurgents who have no interest in working within any political system. Political power is the central issue in insurgencies, and insurgencies are designed to challenge government control while increasing insurgent control and influence. Insurgencies are typically protracted conflicts, which add to long-term regional instability that is often contrary to US national interests. Insurgencies most often end in a negotiated settlement involving a combination of political reform by the HN government, appropriate concessions from the insurgents, and government recognition of the insurgents as “noncriminal.” In most cases, this negotiation is a result of a military defeat of either the government or the insurgency, a stalemate, or the loss of external support that makes the

insurgents no longer able to resist militarily. In any event, government victory tends to cause a splintering of the insurgency, with small elements intent on continuing the fight.

2. Nature of Insurgency

a. Insurgent groups tend to adopt an irregular approach because they initially lack the resources required to directly confront the incumbent government in traditional warfare. In some cases, an irregular approach may also suit the geographic terrain or sociopolitical context of the OE. By adopting an irregular approach, insurgents avoid decisive battles in which the incumbent government can apply its superior combat power. This allows the insurgent to exploit the terrain and population as cover and concealment for their operations. Also, insurgencies may attract terrorists and criminals who take advantage of the unstable OE to commit acts of violence or crime, whether or not they are affiliated with the core insurgency.

b. Insurgents challenge government forces only to the extent needed to progressively attain their political aims. Their efforts seek to not just engage HN military and other security forces, but also to establish a competing system of control over the population, making it increasingly difficult for the government to administer to its people and its territory. Insurgent strategy involves selecting targets and striking when, where, and how it will best support the insurgency's political or operational objectives. Insurgents normally attempt to create effects that cause HNSF (and US forces if committed) to overreact, resulting in excessive innocent civilian casualties and collateral damage. Employing a mixture of force, propaganda, subversion, intimidation, and political mobilization, insurgents seek to exhaust and discredit the governing political authority, undermining its support, decreasing its control over the population, and breaking its will without necessarily decisively defeating its military forces. Insurgencies rely on "propaganda of the deed," which recognizes that actions have significance beyond their direct or immediate consequences, throughout their activities to reinforce their strategic narrative. Often this strategy relies on cumulative effects of operations over a protracted period of time to gradually undermine the credibility and legitimacy of the government in the eyes of the population. In many cases, this is accompanied by a corresponding attempt to supplant government administration with insurgent "shadow" government in more and more areas. Over time, insurgencies work to force governments to the negotiating table or grow until insurgent forces can directly confront and defeat the government security forces and seize control over the seat of government.

c. Insurgencies driven by commercial or criminal objectives are an exception, because commercial and criminal enterprises typically have no interest in overthrowing the government and subsequently assuming the responsibility for governing the population. Rather, they focus on gaining political control of the country's leaders and security apparatus through bribery, fear, and intimidation by extreme violence, so the government will not impinge on their illicit activities. Insurgents do not want those bureaucratic responsibilities, and they rely on the rest of the government's administrative capacity to address the population's expectations for essential services. For powerful criminal enterprises, this is an acceptable cost of doing business.

STRATEGY OF PROVOCATION

Throughout history, insurgents and propagandists have sought to provoke political regimes into overreactions, attempting to discredit government forces or their allies. Often the strategy involves ambushes or attacks in heavily populated areas to produce firefights putting civilians at risk. The Irish Republican Army, Al Qaeda, and Hamas are three practitioners of this approach. Against less professional forces, provocation can induce indiscriminate retaliation against civilians. Sometimes, the strategy is used to ignite ethno-sectarian conflict, consolidating one community behind the insurgents as the only way to secure itself. The February 2006 bombing of the Al Askariya mosque, a sacred site in Shi'ite Islam, by Sunni Al Qaeda in Iraq provides an example.

The lesson for counterinsurgents is clear: selective police or military action against insurgents bolsters government credibility. By demonstrating the ability to accurately identify culprits and punish specific behavior, counterinsurgents establish more effective deterrence while reinforcing that compliance and cooperation will be rewarded. Conversely, indiscriminate violence, where punishment is not clearly linked to conduct in the eyes of the population, is likely to generate only wider resistance as civilians see no benefit to compliance with the host nation government, and particularly no improvement in security. It may also provide additional grievances or additional justification for grievances from which the insurgents can take advantage.

Various Sources

d. Threat networks are those whose size, scope, or capabilities threaten US interests. These networks may include the underlying informational, economic, logistical, and political components. Threat networks can include insurgent, terrorist, or criminal networks, as well as legitimate commercial and social networks. When mapping a network, the COIN force should not infer a network structure where it may not actually exist. Hierarchical networks tend to centralize power and authority through a well-defined vertical chain of command and responsibility. Information flows up and down formal organizational channels corresponding to these vertical chains but may not officially move horizontally through the organization. Nonhierarchical networks are decentralized decision-making structures. Although they do not always have a fixed organizational structure, nonhierarchical networks have a coherence of objectives or goals and tend to have relatively consistent lines or modes of communication. Cells are smaller networks that have a specific purpose within a larger network. In accordance with JP 3-25, *Countering Threat Networks*, a cell is a subordinate organization formed around a specific process, capability, or activity within a designated larger organization, while a node is an element of a network that represents a person, place, or physical object. In this context, it describes a means to visualize the organization as a network. In terms of organizational structure, the primary purpose insurgencies create cells is to achieve security and secrecy through compartmentalization. When a specific organizational function demands these characteristics, a cellular structure is the logical and historical choice. For example, improvised explosive devices (IEDs), financing, recruiting, intelligence, logistics, or core

leadership are examples of functions that may demand compartmentalization. Cells can be organized to accomplish a variety of workflows. Cells may be arranged in series or in parallel. Threat of the use of IEDs is inherent in most COIN operations. Normally, the employment of IEDs is characterized by a nonhierarchical structure. To employ IEDs, threat networks have a complex and often compartmentalized series of nodes, including personnel who: conduct reconnaissance, build IEDs, and teach others to do so; procure and supply IED materials; emplace the IEDs; trigger certain types of IEDs; assess IED effectiveness; and make recommendations on new tactics, techniques, and procedures (TTP) and IED types. Network analysis and identification of nodes are critical tools in defeating the IED network.

For additional details, see JP 3-25, Countering Threat Networks.

e. While transnational terrorism has global implications with multiple concurrent conflicts in the Middle East and other areas, it is not a “global insurgency.” Rather, it is an effort to incite insurgencies in numerous countries that if collectively successful would allow them to establish a global caliphate. Insurgencies are usually conducted in individual countries but in some instances may include contiguous territory in more than one country.

f. The joint intelligence preparation of the operational environment (JIPOE) process is intended to provide sufficient perspective on the issues that significantly influence an insurgency. The JFC, in conjunction with the COM and HN leadership, should develop a shared understanding of the root causes of insurgency. Until these root causes are uncovered, mitigation of the population’s grievances will likely be ineffective. Providing a deeper level of understanding of insurgencies enables planners and analysts to search for the right information to help commanders, their staffs, and forces appreciate the context of the insurgency, appreciate the relevant populations and actors, and develop understanding of the OE. This understanding is related to the unique requirements and capabilities for COIN. The key to COIN is to target the insurgent strategy, which means understanding the insurgents as dynamic, strategic threats who can respond to counterinsurgent initiatives in a creative manner.

3. Conditions for Insurgency

Fundamental to COIN is understanding why and how an insurgency begins. Insurgents do not merely exploit existing grievances, they simultaneously create new grievances by attacking governance institutions, causing insecurity, and worsening conditions for the local population. Insurgents claim one-way causality, that grievances give rise to insurgency. The route from public discontent to violent insurgency varies. The required conditions and underlying causes that are the most common predictors of organized violence manifested in an insurgency are discussed briefly. The three conditions that must be present for an insurgency to develop are opportunity, motive, and means.

a. **Opportunity.** Opportunity alludes to the emergence of significant gaps in the ability of the national government or local allies to provide security for its territory and population. Specifically, the government should have the capability and capacity to detect the early stages of insurgency—organization and mobilization—a challenge that typically

requires a certain awareness and the cooperation of a significant portion of the population. However, if domestic surveillance is perceived as too extensive, it could result in what may be considered a police state. Moreover, the government should be capable of suppressing the insurgency in a way that deters other potential rebels while not feeding the insurgency narrative and not provoking wider resistance to the government. Whether urban or rural, physically definable, or a matter of popular perception, opportunity arises when there is a gap in government control that provides an incipient insurgency with sufficient freedom to begin organizing and maneuvering politically and militarily. This gap may also be seen as a result of security forces either overreacting or appearing to engage in punitive violence not specifically linked to insurgent conduct. Understanding how the gap arose and how the nascent insurgency has exploited it to begin mobilizing an organized resistance provides insights to inform an effective COIN strategy and a planned operational approach. Gaps in government control can stem from insufficient capacity of government security forces, demographic changes, falling government revenues, or eroding legitimacy of governance and declining allegiance among segments of the population.

b. **Motive.** There should be a compelling motive to organize an insurgency, because insurgents are generally treated as violent, traitorous criminals by the security forces, government authorities, and potentially some segments of the indigenous population. The motive may be a complex combination of the following:

(1) **Adopting Grievances.** COIN approaches and negotiated settlements that fail to adequately address the underlying causes of violence and core grievances of the insurgency rarely create durable stability. Core grievances are the key issues the insurgency wants addressed. All societies have grievances that do not rise to the level of inciting violence or subversion; however, when combined with other conditions as discussed earlier, violence may be perceived as the only viable option. The task for the commander and staff is to address core grievances while identifying the factors that cause violence or subversion and developing a plan to address them. The issues associated with the insurgency evolve over time and are transformed by the dynamics of the conflict itself. Political alignments are reshaped as power shifts between different groups and as the insurgents and counterinsurgents interact with communities over time. This highlights a critical challenge for both insurgents and counterinsurgents: co-opting local grievances and political agendas into a broader movement. In many ways, insurgency is an alliance-building process in which leaders with a broad, political vision seek to knit together a patchwork of communities, interest groups, and influential elites. Co-option can be complex and operates in both directions: just as insurgents seek to leverage local grievances, locals also seek to co-opt insurgents and counterinsurgents as allies to win disputes and settle scores with their rivals. Historically, most insurgencies occur in agrarian societies, where disputes over land tenure and water rights are typically among the most important drivers of conflict. This can give rise to a checkerboard effect, in which the decision by one side in a local conflict to ally with insurgents can lead their rivals to side with the government. One key variable in that evolution is whether the relevant communities believe their existence would be threatened by the victory of one side or the other.

(2) **Failed Security.** A failure by government security forces to provide security is also a common driver of instability. This frequently leads communities to look to other groups to fill the gap. Such groups may be concerned solely with securing their own communities when they emerge, but evolve to challenge the state's authority as their legitimacy and ambitions grow.

(3) **Abusive Behavior.** Beyond failing to provide security, the government may itself become a source of insecurity for the population. Some insurgencies actually create or exacerbate grievances, such as by deliberately provoking retaliation by HNSF against the insurgents' own constituency for the anticipated polarizing effect. Abusive behavior by government officials, security forces, or their local supporters can become one of the most potent grievances and often contributes to the emergence of insurgencies. While often linked to disputes over indigenous rights, political power, or economic interests, sometimes corruption and abuses are the consequence of a lack of professionalism or other such institutional shortcomings. Even where it is linked to other disputes, abusive behavior can rise to the level of a grievance in its own right when it severely transgresses cultural norms.

(4) **Elites' Agendas.** Elite attitudes tend to reflect both community-wide grievances, as described above, and a discrete set of concerns about their status, such as elitism often trumping the rule of law. Elites may oppose government or commercial initiatives that could undermine their positions of authority, even if the program would benefit the community. In some cases, it is competition among elites that provides an opening for insurgents to co-opt communities by backing one competitor against others.

(5) **Individual Empowerment.** Reference to communal grievances as a reason for joining an insurgency sometimes masks (or may be mixed with) a simpler desire for adventure, opportunity, or sense of control over one's own destiny. Particularly where traditional social systems have broken down or fail to provide avenues for social advancement for youth, insurgent movements may offer an attractive escape from boredom and stagnation. Becoming an insurgent offers a boost in status and a sense of purpose. That sense of empowerment can be enough to motivate some to take up arms, even as they rhetorically reference other more conventional grievances.

(6) **Community Allegiance.** If a community (i.e., family, clan, tribe, or village) believes it has the option to side with either the insurgency or the government, then, in most cases, allegiance flows to the group that can provide durable control and security. This pattern of shifting allegiance to ensure survival tends to emerge over the course of the conflict and hold true regardless of what a community's political preferences were when the violence began. In this case, "control" means establishing predictable and acceptable conditions for the population: a clear set of rules that are consistently enforced under which they feel they can reasonably survive. The failure to publicize or consistently enforce those rules, or the use of arbitrary punishment, tends to generate opposition among civilians who will then perceive that compliance will not guarantee their basic interests and survival. The effects of shifting allegiance may be extremely complex and have an unpredictable, debilitating effect on the community. For example, when a community believes one side's victory will lead to the community's complete destruction or marginalization, it is unlikely

INDIVIDUAL MOTIVES AND TALIBAN RECRUITMENT IN HELMAND PROVINCE, AFGHANISTAN

The motivating factors for young men to join the Taliban were diverse, frequently highly complex, and not amenable to resolution through the application of reconstruction money. Young men joined the Taliban because they were mobilized through kinship groups, wanted self-protection in a dangerous environment, could not attain status through traditional tribal mechanisms, wanted support for claims to disputed land or resources, and for religious reasons. Religion appeared to play a role in mobilizing some young men, but largely because it legitimized other grievances, such as the lack of support for and from the government and negative perceptions of the actions and presence of foreign forces.

SOURCE: Stuart Gordon, Winning Hearts and Minds? Examining the Relationship Between Aid and Security in Afghanistan's Helmand Province (April 2011)

to see any alternative to fighting to the bitter end. If an insurgency has promoted this belief, proving otherwise can be critical for counterinsurgents. Potentially, the dilemma of a shifting community allegiance may have to be faced repeatedly as the COIN operation or campaign progresses.

c. **Means.** It takes considerable resources to mount a subversive and violent challenge to incumbent government authorities; the ways an insurgency goes about securing those resources determine a great deal about its behavior. The leaders of emerging insurgencies will covertly establish systems that allow them to procure, assemble, and organize personnel, funds, weapons, secure communications, and logistics. Therefore, the counterinsurgent force must be prepared to track and infiltrate these systems from inception through development.

(1) **Recruiting.** Recruitment has an impact on the majority of other means and the degree to which insurgent leaders can leverage pre-existing strong social networks. Modern insurgencies have used the Internet and social media as a key means of recruitment. Social networks may be defined by village; clan; tribe; ethnicity; language; socioeconomic status; religion; or membership in sports clubs, military units, professional associations, or criminal groups. Where those networks exist and insurgent leaders successfully draw on or are able to further exacerbate grievances and differences in identities to mobilize them, recruitment is easier and faster. Moreover, where recruits are bound together by preexisting social ties, unit cohesion and reciprocal loyalty are often stronger. Finally, the ties between insurgents and their communities provide an integral support base from which insurgents can draw other types of resources as well.

(2) **Social Networks and Mobilization.** Individuals and communities are typically members of multiple overlapping groups with whom they may be identified. The degree to which their behavior is shaped by membership in any of these groups depends on multiple variables, but their primary loyalty is defined by important factors such as which side is perceived as most likely to advance their interests, the ease of switching sides,

and which side they expect to win. Switching does not necessarily imply abandoning fundamental social ties to family, friends, or community, but more often it involves a shift in the political or military alliances through which a group seeks to advance its interests and a corresponding redefinition of loyalties and politics. Increasingly, social mobilization is accomplished using social media. In addition to using social media for planning and command and control (C2), insurgencies use social media sites to release propaganda and conduct vital information activities necessary to socially mobilize the populace. The COIN can, and should, use social media to attempt to mitigate the impact of the insurgency's messaging through coordinated information activities. An insurgency relies on social mobilization that is accomplished using social media. This usually entails picking a side (insurgency or government). The process typically draws on existing ethnic, religious, racial, socioeconomic, geographic, or political identities and the symbols associated with them. The insurgency narrative is a key element for social mobilization. Rule of law combined with the provision of basic goods and services does not guarantee perceived legitimacy. There are other forms of authority, namely "traditional" and "charismatic" forms that provide a semblance of legitimacy. Typically, only insurgent leaders who are members of the relevant community possess the required internal legitimacy to mobilize social networks. Where leaders lack that legitimacy, or where they seek to activate networks beyond their own community, the relationship between recruits and resources is reversed: leaders require access to resources to attract and equip recruits. Reliance on social networks constrains insurgent freedom of action by potentially anchoring the insurgency in a well-established set of social norms. Insurgent leaders may leverage specific components of their organizational structure, such as the public component. As the overt political component of an insurgency, the public component can engage in overt social networks while the core leadership remains in the clandestine underground, thus minimizing both social and physical risks.

(3) **Resources.** Like any organization, insurgencies require a continuing flow of resources to supply or fund its activities. Social networks may provide these resources directly or provide access to external resources. In some cases, insurgents exploit available natural resources. Other groups rely on criminal activities, such as kidnapping, smuggling, drug trafficking, human trafficking, counterfeiting, and money laundering. Support from transnational terrorist organizations or state sponsors through funding, recruitment, training, and propaganda is also a viable option.

(4) **Forced Recruitment.** Some insurgent groups also use forced recruitment to bolster their ranks, which often includes the use of women in combat and support roles, in addition to the illegal recruitment of children. In extreme cases, forcible recruitment becomes intertwined more fundamentally with the strategy, ideology, and survival of the insurgent group. In most cases, forcible recruitment occurs alongside voluntary participation. Insurgents may seek to forcibly co-opt a social network by coercing its members to join their ranks. In doing so, insurgents may secure the neutrality or even the support of the rest of the kin-group or community. Often, participation is characterized as a duty based on the identity or narrative promoted by the insurgents. In such cases, social pressure may be used to try to cajole recruitment, but is often reinforced by brutal retaliation against those who resist.

(5) Females as Insurgents

(a) Historically, women have always been involved in insurgencies, in the underground, the military wing, the auxiliary, and the political wing. Modern research indicates women constituted significant proportions (as high as 40 percent) of combatants and combat support operations in conflicts in Eritrea, Mozambique, Zimbabwe, Vietnam, Cambodia, Sri Lanka, Turkey, Nepal, Colombia, Peru, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Uganda, and Rwanda.

(b) Women join insurgent movements for many of the same reasons as men. However, the reasons why women join often reflect certain (patriarchal) cultural traditions regarding how women are regarded and treated within their society. Women may be forced participants, often a result of abduction, or as volunteers. Many have volunteered as a way to gain independence or equality as promised by the leaders of the insurgency, to protect their families, or guarantee access to food and shelter. But more times than not, the promise of equality goes unrealized, leaving women vulnerable to government demobilization programs. While some insurgent groups accept women due to lagging recruitment or the loss of male fighters, others recruit women because they can assume multiple roles, adding to the operational capacity and capabilities of a given unit, as well as to build a more robust support network.

(c) The roles women play in insurgencies range from combatants to cooks, porters, medics/doctors, wives, slaves, intelligence operatives, political officers, disseminators of propaganda, and suicide bombers. Motivations unique to women joining an insurgent movement relate to previous sexual and physical abuse and gender-based marginalization within their communities. In societies where an “honor code” conveys shame upon a woman and her family based upon sexual activity (even if forced or coerced), women who have experienced this form of dishonor may join an insurgent movement as a way to shed their past and create a completely new identity or, in the case of suicide bombers, die an honorable martyr’s death.

(d) Women are active as suicide bombers around the world in support of terrorist organizations and often part of an ongoing insurgency. One reason for this shift is females are generally not expected to perform such roles, despite what current trends suggest. Women can hide bombs under traditional, loose-fitting clothing or disguise bombs as a late-term pregnancy. In some cultures, it is prohibited for a man to conduct a search of a female, thus making it more enticing to use females for terrorist acts.

(6) **Diasporas.** Ethno-sectarian-rooted conflicts are often supported by diaspora communities living in other parts of the world. Diasporas can assist insurgencies with funding and recruitment. Diaspora groups are generally positioned to favorably influence public opinion, policies of their country, and the attitudes of global media toward the insurgents. The use of social media increasingly provides the key method by which the diaspora is mobilized.

(7) **External Sponsors.** External sponsors can either be state or non-state entities. An example of a state sponsor can be found in Vietnam, when China supported

the Viet Cong, with weapons, training, and funding of the insurgent movement. A state bordering the insurgency-inflicted nation can also provide safe havens for insurgent forces to train, rest, and reorganize. In some cases, the neighboring state will not support a safe haven for insurgents; rather, non-state local or regional entities may allow insurgents rest and refuge. An example how non-state entities can support an insurgency is found in the case of Boko Haram using Niger, Chad, and Cameroon for safe haven from Nigeria COIN forces. Due to the close proximity of Boko Harm-held areas in Nigeria, Boko Haram shares languages, ethnicities, and even familial ties across international borders. This happens despite the government efforts of Niger, Chad, and Cameroon to push Boko Harm out of their nations and back into Nigeria.

(8) **Criminal Networks.** The nexus between an insurgency and criminal elements is a recognized reality. The convergence of insurgencies with organized criminal networks will often occur where interests align or overlap. The development of such a nexus requires a sophisticated, interactive, and comprehensive response that accounts for the complex dynamics involved when the line between combatant and criminal action blurs. As a result, an appropriate COIN response requires a unified action between military, interagency, and nongovernmental organizations to achieve unity of effort that attends to all aspects of this complexity.

(a) Criminal networks will tend to be densely populated by a small number of interrelated identity groups. These identity groups form links of affinity and shared understanding, which a criminal enterprise may leverage to form resilient and motivated networks with shared purpose. These networks may form in response to perceived threats to the identity group, and existing networks may leverage overlaps between the core identity group and other groups in the operational area to broaden their support base or attract recruits. Networks with stronger and more numerous links will be more resilient and will experience greater motivation within their membership. Members of such networks have often been vetted for years and are almost impossible to turn. For analysts, identifying affiliations assists in developing a targetable profile on key personnel.

(b) Insurgent and criminal networks continue to converge as the interactions between them increase. This convergence requires increasing attention. Given the nature of many modern threat networks, terrorists and insurgents are no longer clearly distinguishable from organized criminal groups by their motivations and methods. An effective COIN strategy should thus consider the role criminal organizations play in the larger contest for influence within the HN.

4. Insurgency Objectives and End State

An insurgency should not be confused with peaceful demonstrations that might evolve into acts of civil disobedience, even if the demonstrations lead to riots, looting, destruction of property, and physically challenging law enforcement. However, when an insurgency intentionally uses violence in demonstrations, it could be considered an insurgent objective in challenging the state. Insurgents challenge the government by escalating violence and risking their lives until they succeed. Ideally, from the insurgent's perspective, the

government succumbs to the pressure over time and the insurgents favorably negotiate an end.

a. Insurgent objectives can be generally categorized as resistance, reform, nullification, secession, or revolution. To attain the end state, insurgent objectives might be progressive and in line with insurgent capabilities. Insurgent objectives may be integral to the stages of an insurgency. However, these categories are archetypes, and many insurgencies exhibit characteristics of more than one category, often as a result of alliance building, the need for escalating the violence and subversion, and growing support from the population. An insurgency may grow at a different rate in different areas of the country depending upon variations in the political geography, the insurgent concept of operations (CONOPS), and the vision and focus of the insurgent leaders. That progression is necessary because an insurgency requires an evolving process of escalating pressure on the government, beginning at the local levels and moving toward more and more pressure on the national government.

b. Multiple insurgent groups may operate simultaneously, either competing with one another or setting aside differing objectives and views on post-conflict governance to form temporary alliances against the government. The motivations of individual insurgents may differ from that of the group in general. The chaos of insurgency provides ample opportunity to pursue personal agendas under the cover of insurgent action. Likewise, both deviant individuals and criminal organizations exploit conflict to pursue their own objectives through violent means. This complexity can give the insurgency a more chaotic, less-organized quality and create a challenge for analysts trying to distinguish the objectives of the insurgency from various overlapping patterns of violence. Nevertheless, at the broadest level, the objectives of an insurgency most often involve one or more of five categories.

(1) **Resistance.** All insurgencies seek to compel a governing authority to change either policy or practice. The initial insurgency activities would be through subversion, which can be conducted as clandestine or covert resistance to government oversight and intrusion whether against local or national governments or a supporting or occupying foreign government. The drivers and dynamics of movements are more complex than typically understood. Resistance can be passive or aggressive; clandestine, covert, or overt; and conducted in remote, semiautonomous, or socio-politically distinct areas within a country. A resistance objective allows growth and maturing of the insurgency in numbers and capabilities, while pressuring the local and national governments. It can shape the insurgency for moving into the more advanced stages required to fully succeed against the government.

(2) **Reform.** Some insurgencies do not aim to change the existing political order but, instead, seek to compel the government to alter its policies or undertake major political, economic, or social reforms. Reforms may be gained by protests and civil disobedience while disguising random acts of violence during a transition from pre-conflict to the incipient stage of insurgency. However, as insurgent activities to achieve reform objectives fail to move the government, insurgents typically envision deeper changes to the

sociopolitical structure of society or political processes through more direct coercion and activities that can achieve nullification.

(3) **Nullification.** Nullification insurgent efforts to roll back governmental authority in a geographically defined area. For example, warlords or powerful criminal groups may seek greater freedom of action to pursue illicit economic activities. Insurgents may also seek nullification when they perceive outright secession is not feasible and regional autonomy is an acceptable outcome. Additionally, insurgents may seek to nullify state control of an area to create a sanctuary in support of the insurgency. Nullification also works to erode the population's faith and trust in the government and its security forces. Insurgents can achieve nullification during an extended period, beginning with the pre-conflict and extending well into the incipient stage, in a number of geographic areas that may not be comprehended by the national government as a growing national threat. Often, the HN government mistakenly dismisses the early pre-conflict stage of an insurgency as ordinary criminal activities. While achieving certain objectives through nullification, the insurgency can continue to shape the population, recruit, and gain capabilities and external support. Therefore, nullification can be a preparatory stage to secession or revolution. In a failing or failed state, the government is nullifying themselves, and it may be possible for a group to become the legitimate source of authority in that area without violence.

(4) **Secession.** Secession objectives support the insurgency's desire to formally withdraw from an existing state or system of government and establish a new state with political autonomy and distinct sovereign territory. Secessionists are not likely to succeed as insurgents unless they garner a sizable population to enjoin in the secession and are fully capable of denying access to government forces to that area. Secession is likely to be based on different ethnic or religious orientation.

(5) **Revolution.** Insurgents may seek to overthrow and radically reshape the political system, socioeconomic structure, and sometimes even the culture of the nation. Revolutionaries often want to change the fundamental sources of political legitimacy around which government and political authority are organized. In that regard, the revolution objectives are always in line with the conceptual end state of overthrowing the government.

5. Insurgency Narrative and Strategy

a. **Insurgency Narrative.** Insurgent groups harness narratives to communicate grievances, goals, and justifications for actions to both internal and external audiences. Insurgency narratives have three elements or components: actors and the environments in which they operate, events along a temporal continuum, and causality— cause and effect relative to the first two elements. In addition to communicating grievances, goals, and justifications for actions, the insurgency narrative serves as an organizing structure through which each individual can make sense of their environment and the world and provides insight into the beliefs, norms, and values of the group. This facilitates sense making which enables individuals to conceive and formulate their social environment and create a shared worldview amongst members of the group. The strength and success of an insurgency

depends in large part on its ability to shape the behavior of its ranks and the population whose compliance or outright support it may require. Social mobilization depends in large part on the credibility of the insurgent narrative. A narrative is an organizing framework expressed in story-like form. Narratives are central to representing identity, particularly the collective identity of religious sects, ethnic groupings, and tribal elements. They provide a basis for interpreting information, experiences, and the behavior and intentions of other individuals and communities. Stories about a community's history provide models of how actions and consequences are linked. Thus, narratives shape decision making in two ways: they provide an interpretive framework for a complicated and uncertain environment and offer idealized historical analogies that can serve as the basis for strategies.

(1) In the context of insurgency, the narrative is a tool to shape how the population perceives circumstances and events. The narrative is used to link conditions-based grievances to the nature or behavior of the incumbent regime and articulate an alternative political vision that will address those grievances. It provides an explanation and justification of how insurgents will align ends, ways, and means to achieve their political objectives and frames how insurgent and counterinsurgent actions are interpreted. Perhaps most important, insurgents try to create self-reinforcing narratives about which side is most likely to win and therefore influence whose side civilians should follow.

(2) The credibility of an insurgency narrative depends on how the population interprets a mixture of indicators and cues about the nature of the insurgency, its likelihood of success, and the consequences of its failure. The likelihood of insurgent success is based in large part on assessments of insurgent political and military strength. The uncertainty inherent in insurgency, coupled with the competition between insurgent propaganda and counterinsurgent information-related activities, often generates wild rumors and distorted perceptions of particular incidents. Populations can often only assess that strength in their immediate vicinity, generating wildly different perceptions of the broader national environment in different parts of the operational area.

(3) How well culturally relevant symbols and concepts are integrated into the narrative will impact the narrative's success. As described above, individuals and communities typically identify with multiple groups, each one associated with an ideology, codes of behavior, and historical narratives. In most competitions for political power, all sides selectively invoke those identities to justify their pragmatic, calculated decision making in pursuit of their interests. However, identities are not infinitely malleable, and the degree to which they resonate with experiences and circumstances of particular communities varies. To successfully rally the population around a particular identity, insurgents have to articulate their message in a way that is internally consistent with the narratives associated with that identity and the experiences of the targeted audience. It should offer a plausible link between history, myth, and current conditions.

(4) Demonstrating the credibility of its narrative also creates an imperative for action on the part of the insurgents. Making the argument is not sufficient. Insurgents need to continually demonstrate that events reinforce their narrative. This requires words, in the form of propaganda, and deeds, in the form of attacks against the government,

“...the guerrilla campaigns being waged in China today are a page in history that has no precedent. Their influence will be confined not solely to China in her present anti-Japanese struggle, but will be world-wide.”

Mao Tsh-tung, Yu Chi Chan, 1937

enforcement of rules on civilians, and in some cases, provision of alternative governance. The ability to portray the words and deeds of counterinsurgents as confirming the insurgency narrative is equally important.

b. **Strategy.** Insurgent strategies are composed of interdependent political and military dimensions. The relative emphasis on each of those aspects and exactly how they are linked is shaped by the combination of opportunity/motive/means factors and the nature of the insurgent objectives. Strategy is also shaped, in some cases constrained, by the identities around which the insurgency narrative is constructed. Those identities often include deeply rooted cultures of war and codes of conduct that create expectations about how the conflict will be waged that are contrary to American ideas of what is “normal” or “rational.” They may also include deeply rooted historical social grievances, which the insurgent narrative co-opts to mobilize support. Counterinsurgents recognize the insurgency requires interdependent and linked dimensions that are not physical. Because they are not physical, there may be opportunity to exploit strategies and points where the various elements of the insurgency differ regarding specific courses of action (COAs) and methodologies.

(1) **Maoist Strategy for Revolutionary War.** Although the fundamental challenges for insurgents have remained relatively constant, insurgent strategies have evolved along with the changing character of war. The period of modern insurgency is generally regarded as beginning with Chinese Communist insurgency that began in the 1920s. Mao Tse-Tung led a revolution in China, which led to his party taking power and the adoption of Maoism as a revolutionary practice by others across the globe. These strategies have continued successfully, even as recently as 2006 (Nepal), and may continue today. Mao put many theories of strategy into practice, and it is easy to confuse them as elements of strategies or tactics, such as mobile warfare, guerrilla warfare, protracted popular war, and achieving specific political goals may be complimentary. However, he made it clear that revolutionary war should never be confined by military action; its purpose, to replace existing society and institutions with new ones, requires a dynamic and depth that combines military, political, economic, social, and psychological parts to make a whole. Commander’s must not fall into the trap of familiarity, dealing with the military aspects of an insurgency, but rather, recognize all the parts of the insurgency as both individual systems and a system of systems. Mao’s strategy for revolutionary war calls for it to be executed in three phases.

(a) Phase I focuses on organization, consolidation, and preservation of regional base areas. Insurgents establish base areas in rural, isolated, ungoverned, or other areas where the government demonstrates little to no concern. Core cadres are established, and volunteers are trained and indoctrinated. Individual or small groups of insurgents work to build support from the local, surrounding population through agitation subversion,

propaganda, and intimidation. The most effective processes to generate support demonstrate conspiratorial, clandestine, methodical, and progressive patterns. This base of support surrounds the regional base providing an additional layer of security, as well as supply systems for food, recruits, and information. Insurgents promote a narrative that links grievances to a political program of change to mobilize the population, either co-opting existing identities or forging a new one (e.g., raising “class consciousness” among landless peasants). Paramount to this phase is preservation of the nascent organization. For that reason, military operations will be very sporadic. By focusing on organizing, consolidating, and preserving regional base areas, the insurgency is building a strong foundation for the next phase.

(b) Phase II focuses on progressive expansion and involves an increase in guerrilla operations to increase the area of control by the insurgency. During this phase, insurgents step up the scale and intensity of attacks, terrorism, and sabotage and begin directly attacking isolated or remote HNSF bases and lines of communications. Such attacks are designed to erode both the control of the HN government and its ability to provide services to the population, damaging both its coercive apparatus and its basis for legitimacy. Insurgents may also employ a strategy of provocation anticipating security forces will overreact and thereby alienate the government from the population. The combination of continued political action and military operations creates gaps in state control and administration insurgents often fill with alternative or “shadow” governance, while demonstrating their ability to address the grievances of the population. Characteristic of this phase is the strategic stalemate. As phase II progresses, insurgents expand their ranks and procure additional armament in preparation for phase III.

(c) Phase III focuses on decision or destruction of the enemy and occurs when the insurgent forces create an orthodox (conventional) army, at division and regimental strengths. In this phase, guerilla units fall from the main effort, as they are in phase II, and become a supporting effort to the conventional insurgent army. However, they both operate together in coordination. The goal of this phase is the destruction of the COIN forces. Shadow governance begins operating openly in areas controlled by the insurgent forces. Characteristic of this phase is the moving from the strategic defense to strategic offence.

(2) **Focoism.** Focoism is a strategy that contends that rather than mobilizing the population through clandestine political action and subversion, small groups of armed insurgents could accomplish the same goal through military action. Under this theory, attacks by small insurgent militias against the government would inspire a wider uprising among the population. Narrative remains important, but is promoted through military operations rather than propaganda and clandestine organization. Focoism is more a theory than a proven strategy, often referenced in conjunction with the Cuban Revolution, which largely conformed to Maoist doctrine having had overwhelming support from the indigenous population. Focoist strategies subsequently failed in Congo, Argentina, and Bolivia, where its primary author, Che Guerra, was captured. Thus, focosim remains widely discredited, though it is sometimes conflated with other approaches that do not rely on political mobilization as a precursor to military operations. Such insurgencies typically involve groups with access to significant resources through state sponsorship or

exploitation of available natural resources. Access to resources does not necessarily depend on the support or knowledge of the population. However, less dependence on building a political base creates a tendency to rely heavily on coercion for recruitment—in Sierra Leone for example, nearly 90 percent of Revolutionary United Front fighters were abducted and compelled to join the insurgent group.

(3) The Algerian Front de Libération Nationale (FLN) demonstrated a variation on the Maoist approach that combined protracted war in rural areas with urban terrorist tactics. Between 1954 and 1962, the FLN waged an insurgency against France to gain independence for Algeria. Initially based in remote rural areas, the FLN invested heavily in political mobilization and waged an extensive guerrilla campaign against French forces, benefiting from sanctuary and materiel support from neighboring countries. In 1956, it launched a campaign of terrorist bombings in Algiers, the capital. Despite adopting a compartmentalized cellular structure for its urban operations, the FLN organization in Algiers was defeated by February 1957. However, the FLN strategy of provocation was effective: widespread torture and extrajudicial killings by French forces undermined support for COIN operations in France and damaged French legitimacy internationally. By 1960, the French had largely defeated the FLN militarily, but the political impact of its COIN tactics made it impossible for France to achieve its strategic objective: retaining control of Algeria. The Algerian war illustrated both the potential of compound strategies that combine rural and urban insurgent approaches and the overwhelming importance of narrative and perception in contemporary insurgencies.

(4) The Provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA) utilized subversion as another variation on insurgent strategy. Subversion involves the simultaneous, coordinated employment of insurgent violence and participation in the established political system to undermine the government from within. In the case of Northern Ireland, Sinn Fein acted as the political wing of the IRA and participated in the government. Even as the IRA waged an urban insurgency, it leveraged civil disobedience (such as labor strikes, demonstrations, sit-ins, hunger strikes) and Sinn Fein's voice in the political system to attempt to discredit the British government at home and internationally. US forces and their multinational partners encountered similar challenges in Iraq, where political parties such as the Supreme Council for Islamic Revolution in Iraq constituted the political wings of militant organizations, participating in the government even as they contested its control on the ground.

6. Insurgency Organization

While each insurgency will have its own unique organization that may change over time, there are shared general organizational characteristics that provide a general framework for analysis of insurgencies.

a. Insurgencies develop operational approaches from the interaction of various factors and various networks. Insurgencies will develop and adapt their operational approaches and organizational structure to the current conditions of the OE. More specifically, insurgent organizational and operational approaches are directly related to the strength of the HN government. If the HN is strong, the insurgency will have to be more secretive and

selective. Conversely, the insurgency can be bolder if the HN is weak. So, an insurgency may begin organized in cells linked by leaders and may evolve into more of a hierarchical organization as it grows and gains popular support.

(1) **Politically organized** insurgencies develop a complex political structure before or at the same time they begin undertaking military operations against the government. These groups stress consolidating control of territory through the use of shadow governments rather than through military power. The military component of politically organized insurgencies is subordinate to the political structure.

(2) **Militarily organized** insurgencies emphasize military action against the government over political mobilization of the population. The insurgents calculate military success and the resulting weakening of the government will cause the population to rally to the insurgents' cause. Militarily organized insurgencies begin with small, weak, ill-defined political structures, often dominated by military leaders. However, a militarily organized insurgency does not imply all its members are fighters.

(3) **Traditionally organized** insurgencies draw on preexisting identities through tribal, clan, ethnic, or religious affiliations. Established social hierarchies—a system of chiefs and sub-chiefs, for example—often substitute for political and military structures in traditionally organized insurgencies.

(4) **Cellular-organized** insurgencies develop and are centered in urban areas. These insurgencies lack hierarchical political and military leadership structures, instead organizing around small, semiautonomous cells. Urban-cellular insurgencies generally rely more heavily on terrorism than do other types of insurgency. Their cellular structure and reliance on terrorism can limit their ability to mobilize popular support.

b. **Political and Military Components.** Insurgent structure may be generally broken down into two wings: political and military. Insurgent sociocultural factors, approaches, and resources tend to drive its organization. Figure II-1 depicts various activities these two wings may perform, from covert and clandestine actions to overt military actions. Progression up the diagram does not have to be linear; insurgencies can perform many of these activities at any time, in any order or combination.

(1) **Political Wing.** Insurgencies will have some form of political wing, although some may only require an emerging political wing. The political wing is primarily concerned with either participating in the legitimate political process to further the objectives of the insurgency, undermining the process, or fighting the process outright. The political wing of the insurgency builds credibility and legitimacy for the insurgency within the population and potentially with the international community. Undermining the legitimacy of the HN government and its allies, while building up support for the insurgency, may serve as one objective accomplished through legitimate political participation. The political wing may downplay insurgent violence and subversion, some to the point of outright deception. HN disruption or denial of the legitimate actions of this wing tends to exacerbate the situation and create more contempt for the HN government, creating another core grievance validating the insurgent actions. Connections between the




Figure II-1. Insurgent Actions, Political and Military

political wing and the military wing should be disrupted to the greatest extent possible without limiting the legitimate activities of the political wing that provide a legal voice of the insurgents into the political process.

(a) **Shadow Government.** An insurgency and its political wing may become strong enough to not only challenge the HN government, but it may act as an alternative government. It may provide some or all of the functions or services of a government, for example food distribution, health care, security, deciding legal issues, and education. Normally the shadow government will attempt to satisfy grievances in local areas first. They may attempt to transfer blame for any residual issues to foreign presence or the HN government to facilitate popular support.

(b) **Supportive Parties.** While not part of the insurgency, an existing legal political party may come to support the insurgency or may form a legal political party that supports the insurgency. These legal political parties may become the insurgents' conduit for diplomacy and political reconciliation. In some cases, the political party may consist of former insurgent strategic leaders and cadre. Efforts should be made to open and maintain these avenues for reconciliation.

(2) **Military Wing.** The military wing of the insurgency is the fighting arm of the movement. It can consist of guerilla, conventional, and terrorist networks, or a combination of the three. Most insurgencies may initially have few combatants; however, military-focused insurgencies will concentrate on this wing to build their guerrilla force (military) capability and capacity over time, execute overt operations, and go back into hiding to survive. As the insurgency grows in relative strength, the best guerilla units could be converted to conventional insurgent forces. That does not mean all the guerilla units are disbanded; rather, both can exist and conduct irregular warfare (IW) and traditional warfare in concert with each other. Thus, if security is ineffective or the insurgency has grown powerful relative to the HN government, the military elements may exist openly. If the state maintains a continuous and effective security presence, some part of the military wing will likely maintain a secret existence.

c. **Elements.** Insurgent organizations are often composed of different elements that perform complementary but distinct roles. Some elements openly challenge the government through public actions, guerrilla activities, and terrorist attacks. Other elements operate through covert or clandestine methods, subverting existing political and civil institutions to support the insurgency or damage the legitimacy of the HN government. The proportion or presence of each element relative to the larger organization depends on the strategic approach the insurgency uses and the opportunity, motive, and means factors. In many cases, these categories overlap and individuals may shift between them as the conflict and the insurgency evolve. This is especially true where insurgencies are based on existing social networks such as tribes and clans. The following categories should be regarded as illustrative; each insurgency should be carefully analyzed to identify the overt and covert elements within its organizational structure.

(1) **Political and Military Leadership.** Leaders are the strategic planners and are responsible for developing the insurgency narrative. They usually exercise leadership through some mixture of force of personality, the power of ideology, public esteem, or personal charisma. In some insurgencies, they may hold their position through religious, clan, or tribal authority. The leaders of movements based on religious extremism may also be religious figures. In loosely organized insurgencies, authority may be distributed across

the leaders of multiple smaller groups that share similar or overlapping goals, such as expelling an occupier. Within an insurgent group, responsibility for political and military leadership may be consolidated in a single chain of command or be divided across different individuals or elements of the insurgent organization. Political leaders—historically referred to as a cadre—develop, spread, and enforce insurgent ideology. They seek to widen support domestically and internationally through information-related activities and propaganda and may function as a shadow government or government-in-exile. Political leaders play a key role in coordinating guerrilla operations with other subversive or violent activities to promote the insurgency narrative.

(2) **Underground.** The underground is that element of the insurgent organization that conducts operations in areas normally denied to the auxiliary and the guerrilla force. The underground is a cellular organization within the insurgency that conducts covert or clandestine activities that are compartmentalized. This secrecy may be by necessity, by design, or both, depending on the situation. Most underground operations are required to take place in and around population centers that are held by counterinsurgent forces. Underground members often fill leadership positions, overseeing specific functions that are carried out by the auxiliary. The underground and elements provide coordinated capabilities for the insurgent movement. The key distinction between them is the underground is the element of the insurgent organization that operates in areas denied to the guerrilla force. Members of the underground often control cells used to neutralize informants and collaborators from within the insurgency and the population.

(3) **Guerrillas.** Guerrillas are one element of the insurgent military wing. They are paramilitary forces who conduct limited attacks, raids, and ambushes. Under favorable conditions, guerrillas can mass and attack HNSF who are isolated, small in composition, or exploit other situations that give the guerrilla force a decided advantage. Guerrillas can also support the insurgency's conventional forces in offensive operations, as well as providing defense for insurgent bases, communities, and lines of communications. They also protect training camps and networks that facilitate the flow of money, instructions, and foreign and local fighters. Guerrillas include any individual member of the insurgency who commits or attempts an act of overt violence or terrorism in support of insurgent goals. Guerrilla leaders are considered part of the combatant element for analyzing insurgencies.

(4) **Auxiliary.** Auxiliary forces are the insurgency's support elements. The auxiliary includes cells and external elements. Cells may include, but are not limited to, logistics, intelligence, counterintelligence, propaganda, population control, and recruiting elements. Ranging from sympathetic individuals who store weapons or warn of COIN force activities to major providers of finances or materiel, these supporters are critical to the insurgency and, when solely providing support, are not participating in hostilities. It should be noted that members of the insurgency perform multiple roles throughout the course of a conflict. Those providing auxiliary support on some occasions may also participate in combat operations on other occasions. Typical activities include running safe houses, storing weapons and supplies, acting as couriers, providing intelligence collection, giving early warning of counterinsurgent movements, providing funding from lawful and unlawful sources, and providing forged or stolen documents and access or introductions to potential supporters. COIN forces face key challenges in distinguishing between voluntary

supporters and those who have been coerced into cooperating with insurgency, understanding the complex motives of supporters, and neutralizing or co-opting them without appearing oppressive to the broader population that is unaware of their activities.

d. Transnational and Transregional Violent Extremists. The influence of transnational and transregional violent extremist organizations (VEOs), such as ISIS [Islamic State of Iraq and Syria] and al Qaeda or their associates, on certain insurgencies has added to the complexity of conducting COIN. The HN and USG COIN operation in a given country should analyze the potential for transnational and transregional terrorist activities and whether or not they are an acknowledged part of the insurgency network(s) in the affected HN. The challenge posed by transnational and transregional extremists has been documented globally and, in some regions, it crosses AOR boundaries. US policy and strategy have designated transnational terrorists as terrorists, and not as insurgents, even if one of their primary objectives is the overthrow of the sitting governments in the affected countries within a region. The US global campaign against transnational terrorists, and the role of United States Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) as the DOD global integrator for CT planning, should provide seamless capabilities that are employed globally in coordination with the GCCs and integrated with their theaters' counterterrorist assets. Although the influence of the transnational terrorists may be felt across a region and globally, an insurgency is nation-centric, as is COIN. COIN is supported, as necessary, by dedicated counterterrorist capabilities under a DOD global campaign plan, which in turn is supported by appropriate theater concept plans or operation plans.

7. Stages and Outcomes of Insurgency

a. Shaped by its context and objectives, every insurgency develops differently, but some general patterns can be observed. Insurgencies may evolve through subversion and radicalization, popular unrest, civil disobedience, localized guerrilla activity, and widespread guerrilla operations to open, armed conflict by large conventional formations. Alternatively, they may wither away to dormancy if they are effectively countered or if they fail to capture sufficient popular support.

b. One or more distinct stages may appear in different areas simultaneously in a country affected by insurgency. Similarly, different insurgent groups or different factions of the same group operating in a given country may be at different stages or even evolving through different operational approaches.

c. An insurgency may succeed in gaining control of a contested region, overthrowing the government, force the government into political accommodation (a more common outcome), be co-opted by the government and cease fighting (also common), or ultimately be defeated. In general, insurgencies are typically protracted conflicts.

d. Insurgencies may be co-opted by domestic or transnational terrorist groups, morph into criminal networks, or wither into irrelevance. Measures that succeed against incipient insurgencies often differ greatly from those that are effective against mature or declining insurgencies. Exhaustion and errors by either side can push the conflict toward resolution, either on the battlefield or through negotiation. Thus, planners and decision makers should

clearly understand the stages the insurgency has reached to develop appropriate responses or to thwart its overall progression.

(1) **Pre-Conflict Stage.** An insurgency in the pre-conflict stage is difficult to detect because most activities are conducted covertly by the underground and guerrillas, and the insurgency has yet to make its presence felt through the use of acknowledged acts of violence. Moreover, some actions conducted in the open can easily be dismissed as nonviolent political activity. During this stage, an insurgent movement is beginning to organize: leadership is emerging, the insurgents are mobilizing around a grievance or a group identity, beginning to recruit and train members and stockpiling arms and supplies.

(2) **Incipient.** An insurgency enters the incipient conflict stage when the insurgents begin to use violence. Often these initial attacks provide analysts the first alert to the potential for an insurgency. The government under attack, however, may frequently dismiss insurgent actions as the work of bandits, criminals, or terrorists, which increases the risk the government will employ counterproductive measures. The incipient stage is the most dangerous phase for insurgents; they have made their presence known through violent activities, but are still weak and in the process of organizing. Insurgents should balance the need to demonstrate their viability, publicize the insurgent cause, rally supporters, gain illicit funding, and provoke government overreactions while limiting their exposure to government security forces. During this phase, insurgents may conduct raids, ambushes, limited attacks, terrorist attacks, assassinations, and acts of intimidation (e.g., kidnapping or “night letters” where the target is provided a written warning to cease an activity or suffer consequences). Understanding the characteristics, capabilities, and actions of both the insurgents and the government can help analysts assess whether an incipient conflict is likely to sputter out or expand into an open conflict.

(3) **Open Conflict Stage.** At this stage, there is no doubt the government is facing an insurgency. Politically, the insurgents are overtly challenging governing authorities and attempting to exert control over territory. Militarily, the insurgents are staging more frequent guerilla attacks and will combine them with the insurgent conventional military force. As the insurgency becomes more active, external support for the insurgents probably becomes more apparent, if it exists.

(4) **Resolution.** Some insurgencies progress steadily through the life cycle stages. Many grow in fits and starts, occasionally regressing to earlier stages. Others remain mired in one stage for years. An insurgency will, however, eventually reach a conclusion, either an insurgent victory, a negotiated settlement, or a government victory. At least 130 insurgent conflicts have occurred since World War II. As of 2017, there are dozens of insurgencies still active around the globe.

e. **Insurgent Victory.** An insurgent victory can manifest as a defeat of COIN forces or a negotiated settlement that resolves the insurgencies core grievances. Signs insurgents may be on the verge of obtaining their goal include:

(1) Withdrawal of support for the government by specific, critical segments of the HN population, possibly even including elites aligned with the government leaving the country.

(2) Evidence the population increasingly views the government as illegitimate.

(3) Insurgent co-optation, incorporation, or elimination of other major groups opposed to the government.

(4) Withdrawal of support for the government from critical foreign allies or increasing international support or recognition for the insurgents.

(5) Rapid growth of insurgent forces or significant expansion of insurgent control of territory and population.

(6) Severe weakening of the national economy, possibly including departure of multinational corporations, as a result of the insurgency.

(7) Reports of military plots, coup attempts, massive desertion, defection, or surrender of security forces.

(8) A government willingness to seek a negotiated settlement with the insurgents.

f. **Negotiated Settlement.** Negotiated settlement is a progressive process involving a number of steps. A negotiated settlement is likely to have many false starts, delays in implementation, and attempts by spoilers to undermine the agreement. Moreover, the risk of renewed violence—either by the original insurgent organization protesting perceived government duplicity or by splinter groups unsatisfied with the terms of the settlement—might persist for several years after fighting has officially ended. Recognizing sincere efforts to reach a negotiated settlement can be difficult because insurgents often conduct negotiations to buy time to recover from setbacks and to prepare for the next round of fighting. If the conflict has been protracted, the insurgents' expectations of a purely military victory will probably be tempered and they will be more likely to seek genuine compromise. The insurgents are unlikely to reach this conclusion until they have been fighting for some time, suggesting that sometimes an insurgent conflict needs to run its course for a while before serious negotiations are possible. The first part of the process usually starts with a military stalemate. The HN government should accept that the insurgency can operate as a legitimate negotiator in the process to reach a political solution. A negotiated settlement will usually have intermediate agreements, concessions, ascensions of moderate leaders, and often, a guarantor. Ceasefires may be routinely broken to force changes in relative negotiating position. Indicators insurgents are sincere in their desire for negotiation include:

(1) Reports neither side believes it can win militarily.

(2) Reports the insurgents believe they can win an election or otherwise achieve their goals through legal political participation.

(3) A moderation of insurgent goals. Incorporation into the government's negotiating position of a liberal amnesty offer and mechanisms for former insurgents to participate in the legal political process.

(4) A dramatic and/or unexpected battlefield victory followed by overtures to negotiate. Since neither party wants to negotiate from a position of weakness, a belligerent on the decline may seek a symbolic victory to improve its bargaining position.

(5) Evidence foreign patrons or allies are cutting off support or are pressing the insurgents or the government to negotiate.

(6) A change of government that brings to power a strong leader whom the insurgents view as personally committed to resolving the conflict and capable of ensuring the compliance of other government elements.

(7) Willingness of both sides to accept mediation and monitoring of a cease-fire and the eventual implementation of an agreement.

g. Government Victory

(1) A government victory can be a protracted process marked by gradual decline in violence as the insurgents lose military capabilities, external assistance, and popular support. Low-level violence may persist for years, and, lacking a climactic final battle, the end will probably be indistinct. However, in some recent cases, such as Sri Lanka and the Democratic Republic of Congo, there have been decisive counterinsurgent military victories.

(a) As the government succeeds in reducing the number of insurgents and the size of their infrastructure, the insurgents become harder to find and to eliminate.

(b) If the conflict has lasted a long time, insurgency may have become a way of life for many fighters, and the violence may continue long after the insurgents have abandoned any hope of achieving their goals. The conflict is even more likely to persist if the insurgents have become heavily involved in criminal activities (i.e., drug trafficking, smuggling, or resource plunder), which can become the insurgency's primary reason for existence.

(2) Signs of an impending government victory might be ambiguous and seem more like atmospheric than specific indicators. Evidence of daily life returning to normal, government services and administration fully functioning, and government forces operating nationwide probably suggest the government has effectively defeated or contained the insurgency. Other specific signs that can signal a government victory include:

(a) Commercial activity increases, markets reopen, and businesses remain open after dark.

(b) Civilians feel safe enough to leave their homes at night.

(c) Refugees or internally displaced persons (IDPs) voluntarily return to their homes.

(d) Civilians openly interact with officials or security force personnel.

(e) Civilians promptly alert security forces to the presence of insurgents.

(f) Officials can travel with minimal security and can spend their nights in areas that formerly were unsafe.

(g) Government offices are open and functioning normally.

(h) Security forces—even in small units—are able to operate throughout the country, including in formerly insurgent-held areas.

(i) The police reclaim responsibility for security, and the military largely returns to base.

Intentionally Blank

CHAPTER III COUNTERINSURGENCY

“In small wars, caution should be exercised, and instead of striving to generate the maximum power with the forces available, the goal is to gain decisive results with the least application of force. In small wars, tolerance, sympathy, and kindness should be the keynote of our relationship with the mass of the population. Small wars involve a wide range of activities including diplomacy, contacts with the civil population, and warfare of the most difficult kind.”

**Small Wars Manual
United States Marine Corps, 1940**

1. Overview

a. COIN is the blend of comprehensive civilian and military efforts designed to simultaneously defeat and contain insurgency and address its root causes. Some of the key objectives of COIN operations are to reduce violence, address core grievances, and enable the HN government to exercise political control over its population territory via a system of legitimate governance. Therefore, COIN is fundamentally an armed political competition between a government and its partners and insurgents and their supporters. Military operations to kill or capture insurgents, degrade their capabilities, and disrupt their organizations are a critical element of a broader comprehensive approach. However, COIN is a complex, protracted effort that often requires the integration of capabilities, typically associated with peace operations (PO), foreign humanitarian assistance (FHA), stability actions, SC, FID, and CT, with those of numerous interagency partners to help the HN government marginalize insurgents and win the support of the population. Governments often severely underestimate the financial, political, military, and human costs required to prevail in COIN.

(1) COIN approaches should be adaptable and agile. Strategies need to utilize a balanced approach that seeks to affect the population and insurgents; these strategies will seek to reinforce the legitimacy of the affected government while reducing insurgent influence. This can often only be achieved in concert with political reform to improve the quality of governance and address underlying grievances, many of which may be legitimate.

(2) Since US COIN operations will normally involve support to a foreign government (either independently or as part of an international organization or multinational force), success will often depend on the willingness of that government to undertake the necessary political changes, if applicable. However great its know-how and enthusiasm, an outside organization (e.g., USG) cannot fully compensate for lack of will, incapacity, or counterproductive behavior on the part of the supported HN government.

b. Every insurgency is unique. Reestablishing the HN control and perceived legitimacy requires a coherent, realistic political strategy that is focused on addressing the opportunity, motive, and means at the root of the insurgency. Likewise, a COIN operation or campaign to implement that strategy should be carefully aligned to the particular nature

of the insurgency; the physical, economic, political, and human dimensions of the OE; and the nature of the HN government and its security forces.

c. Effective and legitimate forms of HN governance may differ significantly from Western models. They may involve decentralized authority, a blend of formal and informal governance systems, and/or very different expectations about the role of the state in the lives of its citizens. There is no universal model: to succeed, both the political-military strategy and the operational approach to COIN should be adapted to local conditions.

d. All governments rule through a combination of consent and coercion. Governments described as legitimate tend to rule primarily with the consent of the governed and strictly limit their use of coercion against their citizens to that which is necessary for the enforcement of well-defined criminal and civil law. Those described as illegitimate tend to rely more heavily on coercion to maintain control and suppress peaceful political contention. Citizens of the latter obey the state for fear of the consequences of doing otherwise, rather than because they voluntarily accept its rule. While even a legitimate government may use coercion to enforce the law, most of its citizens voluntarily accept its authority to govern. Legitimate governance is inherently more stable. The societal support it engenders allows it to adequately manage internal problems, change, and conflict.

e. The struggle for legitimacy in the eyes of the relevant population is typically a central theme of the conflict between the insurgency and the HN government. Insurgents exploit the HN government's loss of legitimacy with one part of the population to launch an operation or campaign to extend their influence and control over the rest of the populace. Insurgencies employ a mixture of violence, subversion, and governance to establish a system of competitive control, undermine the legitimacy of the HN government, and buttress their own legitimacy. COIN should reduce the credibility of the insurgency while strengthening the legitimacy of the HN government. The joint force should normally establish and maintain legitimacy with both the HN government and the indigenous population. In accordance with the law of war and higher guidance, the commander should ensure actions are legal and just, increasing the chance for favorable public opinion and support of sustained COIN operations. Counterinsurgents achieve this objective by undertaking appropriate actions and striving for a balanced application of force that creates lethal and/or nonlethal effects as dictated by the local circumstances.

(1) **Legitimacy in the Local Context.** Legitimacy is achieved by the HN government through being perceived by the populace as sufficiently effective and credible to meet the expectations of the populace. The HN government achieves this by providing predictable and acceptable living conditions to the population. Legitimacy is ultimately decided in the minds of the population, and therefore, the COIN operation works to ensure the HN government meets the baseline expectations of the population. Different cultures may see acceptable levels of development, corruption, and political participation differently. The importance of securing the population in situations where violence has escalated cannot be overemphasized. Establishing security can win the people's confidence, gain credibility, and enable the HN government to develop legitimacy in other areas. If the local population considers genocide or the exclusion of some ethnic minorities

as legitimate, the joint force will face a particular challenge in working with the HN government to change these perceptions.

(2) **Indicators of Legitimacy.** Possible indicators of legitimacy exist that can be used to analyze threats to stability. For one, a main contributor to legitimacy is the ability to provide security for the populace, including protection from internal and external threats. Another main contributor is the selection of leaders in a manner considered just and fair by a substantial majority of the populace, as established in a constitution, religious text, tribal custom, or similar accepted method. Other indicators of legitimacy may include: a level of popular participation in or support for national and local political processes that are consistent with local expectations; an acceptable balance between governmental corruption and transparency; a culturally acceptable level and rate of political, economic, and social development; the existence and acceptance of laws or legal system that is predictable and acceptable to the local population; and a high level of acceptance of the pillars of government by major social institutions.

f. **Success in COIN.** Non-western countries may have a different approach and definition of success that may be less population-friendly and more focused on the military defeat of the insurgency. A COIN operation may be deemed successful in accordance with “western” cultural norms when the following conditions are met:

(1) The affected HN government is able to exercise control over its population and territory via systems of governance that meet the population’s expectations.

(2) The HN government has adequate capacity and willingness to address the core grievances of an insurgency; government corruption is reduced and good governance increases.

(3) HNSF establish positive relations with the population, especially in the area of conflict and have the quality not just quantity of sufficient strength to counter the insurgents. Insurgent violence has been reduced to a level that is manageable by the civilian authorities (i.e., law enforcement and security forces) of the HN government.

(4) Nonindigenous elements of the counterinsurgent force (i.e., US forces) can terminate combat operations and transition to indirect and/or direct support FID categories, as required by the HN, without the resurgence of the insurgency beyond the capabilities of the HN. HN forces are dominating the offensive. Simultaneously, external military support for the insurgency is waning.

g. **Impediments to Success.** The JFC should not assume both the HN government and the insurgents want a definitive end to the insurgency. Over time, both the HN government and the insurgents develop a vested interest in the continuation of an insurgency based conflict. For the insurgents, it becomes a way of life. In some insurgencies like Colombia, there are third and fourth generation insurgents. The more time and effort insurgents give to the insurgency, the less time they have to develop marketable skills. In addition, a “war economy” develops in which insurgents, criminals, and even corrupt elements of the HN profit from the conflict through illicit activities (i.e.,

smuggling, kidnapping, and black markets) and/or the influx of external assistance (i.e., development assistance, Commanders' Emergency Response Program spending, economic investment). Moreover, for the HN government, a continuing insurgency can be a source of continued outside assistance or a method to provide an alibi for certain government actions such as exorbitant security restrictions or punitive reprisals. The government might face lower expectations for economic development and promotion of rights. Hence, the government could benefit from the continuation of an insurgency that does not threaten to overthrow it.

2. Counterinsurgency Mindset

a. COIN is distinguished from traditional warfare due to the focus of its operations—a relevant population—and its strategic purpose—to gain or maintain control or influence over—and the support of that relevant population through political, psychological, and economic methods. Warfare that has the population as its focus of operations requires a different mindset and different capabilities than warfare that focuses on defeating a threat militarily. In COIN operations, this means an adaptive and flexible mindset to understand the population, anticipate insurgent actions, be comfortable among the population, and appreciate the comprehensive approach of unified action. As a potential COG for the HN government and often insurgents, the population is typically the critical aspect of successful COIN. Counterinsurgents should learn to think like the local population and to understand how local perceptions are formed to better appreciate the impact their actions will have on HN government and USG legitimacy. This requires an intimate knowledge of the grievances the insurgency has co-opted and the narrative it has used to mobilize support. A second aspect of the COIN mindset is being able to understand the insurgency strategy and narrative to anticipate and counter their operations. Finally, counterinsurgents should understand the military instrument of national power is only one part of a comprehensive approach through unified action for unity of effort. In addition to the security situation, the joint force may have to be flexible enough to execute tasks other organizations are better suited to conduct.

b. The core of COIN is the political strategy, which should articulate how the HN will address the root causes (opportunity, motives, and means) that drive the insurgency. The strategy provides a framework around which all other programs and activities are organized. Depending on the root causes of the insurgency, the strategy may involve a mixture of political reform, reconciliation, popular mobilization, economic development, and governmental capacity building. In general terms, a COIN operation is only as good as the political strategy it supports and only as good as the HN's motivation to enact the above political reforms and capacity building. Where the political strategy is vague, unrealistic, or lacking in support from domestic or international stakeholders, the operation is unlikely to succeed, whatever the merit of individual programs. An effective political strategy focuses on strengthening the government's capability, capacity, and willingness to respond—and be perceived as responding—to the expectations of its people.

c. Regaining legitimacy by the HN government will almost always require a degree of political reform to successfully address the root causes that gave rise to insurgency in the first place. Factions of the HN government may prove reluctant or unwilling to adopt

those reforms because they threaten powerful political or economic interests. However, HN governments are not monolithic; the JFC, in cooperation with the COM, should thoroughly assess its HN partners to understand the perspectives and interests of different individuals and networks. Based on that detailed analysis, the USG can structure its assistance to the HN government in ways that promote reform.

d. Comprehensive Approach. COIN requires unified action through interagency and interorganizational coordination of the instruments of national power to support an HN's political, security, economic, and information components that reinforce the legitimacy of the HN government and its effective control of the OE. By doing this, the population will support the HN government rather than the insurgency. Theater strategies should emphasize those functions for shaping and executing COIN. To be effective, officials involved in COIN should address two imperatives—political action and security—with equal urgency, recognizing that insurgency is fundamentally an armed political competition. Effective security through military activities, although unlikely to deliver success alone, will almost always be critical to the political resolution. Security operations conducted in support of a COIN strategy, coordinated with economic development, and integrated within the CCS process, enhance security for the population and potentially improve the overall political situation at the local level. This should increase acceptance of the HN government and, in turn, popular support for the HN and USG COIN operation. COIN functions, therefore, include informational, security, political, economic, and development components, all of which are designed to support the overall objective of establishing and consolidating control by the HN government. The sociocultural factors of the HN should be taken into account when developing the political strategy that will frame the application of the functional components of the comprehensive approach.

(1) **Political Component.** This is the core of COIN, because it provides a framework around which all other programs and activities are organized. As described above, depending on the root causes of the insurgency, the strategy may involve elements of political reform, reconciliation, popular mobilization, and governmental capacity building. COIN is only as good as the political strategy they support. Tactical, civil, and military efforts cannot compensate for a strategy that does not match the political and operational realities on the ground or lacks support from key stakeholders. Effective strategies address both the actual capability, capacity, and willingness of the HN government to meet the expectations of its citizens and how it is perceived by the population. It cannot be overstated that the political strategy should account for the sociocultural factors of the HN population. The existence of an insurgency reflects that a portion of its population is dissatisfied and may no longer view the government as legitimate. In almost all cases, regaining that legitimacy will require a degree of political behavior modification (substantive political reform, anticorruption, and governance improvement) to successfully address the root causes that gave rise to insurgency in the first place. Supporting nations may be able to assist the HN in these reforms.

(2) **Security Component.** In COIN operations, the term security is frequently used to refer to the degree to which the HN government can suppress insurgent activity in an area. However, the concept of “human security” is a more comprehensive approach

which can only be measured through the collation of individual perceptions across a community. The paramount concern is the absence of physical violence, but other relevant factors may include freedom from intimidation; maintenance of laws; protection of human rights; freedom to conduct economic activity; public safety; and public health, including essential services such as safe drinking water and sanitation. The expectations and priorities of the population define which factors are relevant and what constitutes acceptable conditions. The emphasis on physical security in COIN does not imply disregard for other aspects of human security—only prioritization. The end state of providing human security should be implicit in the wider efforts to improve the standard of governance down to the local level. In some areas, the sequencing is reversed, and addressing other aspects of human security—such as rule of law and security of livelihoods—may be a prerequisite to establishing a security presence capable of defending the population from insurgent violence.

(3) **Economic Component.** The economic component in COIN includes immediate humanitarian relief and the provision of essential services such as safe water, sanitation, basic health care, livelihood assistance, and primary education. In COIN, economic initiatives should be carefully tailored to respond to the economic grievances insurgents exploit in their narrative. Unfair distribution of services is often a grievance, so leaders should be cognizant of avoiding the creation of new grievances through disproportionate provision of services. Longer-term programs for development of infrastructure to support agricultural, industrial, educational, medical, and commercial activities will not necessarily be part of the economic function in COIN unless they support the political strategy and can be used to counter the insurgency narrative. In all cases, economic initiatives should be tailored to the affected government's willingness to undertake key reforms, capacity to absorb support, reduce dependency of foreign donors to sustain stability, and ability to manage its outcomes.

(4) **Information Component.** In COIN, the information flow can be roughly divided into information which the USG requires to guide its political-military approach (i.e., knowledge of local conditions) and information which the USG wishes to disseminate to influence populations. At the same time, counterinsurgents also seek to impede the information flow of insurgent groups—both their intelligence collection and their ability to influence the relevant population.

(5) **Control.** The four components identified above contribute to the overall objective of enabling the affected government to control its environment. This implies the ability to contain insurgent activity (the tempo of operations, level and intensity of violence, and degree of instability that it engenders) such that the population will, in the long run, support the government against the insurgents—noting that this balance can differ from one society to the next.

e. **Unified Action in COIN.** Unified action that includes all HN, US, and participating multinational forces and agencies normally requires the COM, in conjunction with the designated JFC, to lead the overall USG COIN in coordination with the HN government. The COM typically provides the JFC coordinating authorities to interact with the HN government and its military/security forces depending on the specific situation.

Military participation in COIN may also be focused on support to a USG FID program, including security sector reform (SSR) or support to an HN IDAD program. Both FID and SSR may be supported through security force assistance (SFA), and both would support the HN government eventually taking over the combat operations of the COIN operation and supporting other stabilization efforts as required. In some hostile or unpredictable OEs, the JFC should be prepared to lead COIN until a COM can assume that responsibility. The JFC would focus military operations as part of a comprehensive approach.

3. Tenets of Counterinsurgency

The operational tenets of COIN are to provide guideposts for the joint force. These tenets complement the principles of joint operations and provide focus on how to successfully conduct COIN. The tenets of COIN are further supported by the tactical precepts of COIN.

For additional information on the principles of joint operations, see JP 3-0, Joint Operations.

a. **Understand the OE.** Because each COIN operation is different, significant time and resources are devoted at the outset to develop a robust understanding of the nature of the conflict, the insurgency, and a holistic understanding of the OE where COIN will take place (see Chapter IV, “The Operational Environment,” for an explanation of understanding the OE in COIN). It is through this understanding that the JFC can decipher the true nature of the problem the joint force operation is meant to resolve, develop realistic end states and objectives, identify an operational approach that is relevant to the nature of the conflict and appropriate for the local context of the operational area, determine feasible operations based on available resources, consider relevant aspects of the OE during planning activities for increased chances of success, and determine potential second- and third-order effects. By clearly understanding the nature of the challenge, the COIN force can align forces, capabilities, missions, and objectives. All members of the COIN force work to develop and maintain a common understanding of key aspects of the conflict and the OE. This common understanding helps drive coordination and synchronization of the efforts of all COIN partners during the planning and execution of operations. COIN operations are dynamic, and the situation within the OE can change rapidly, requiring the joint force to constantly monitor, evaluate, and assess the nature of the conflict and the operationally relevant aspects of the OE.

(1) **Sociocultural Knowledge.** Sociocultural knowledge is essential to successful COIN. Members of other societies will more than likely have different notions of rationality, appropriate behavior, religious devotion, political organization, social order, and norms concerning gender. What may appear abnormal or strange to an external observer may appear as self-evidently normal to an HN group member and vice versa. US counterinsurgents (especially commanders, planners, and small-unit leaders) should strive to avoid imposing their ideal of normalcy on a foreign culture. US personnel should keep in mind that cultural norms and traditions are often linked to political agendas and ideologies, may vary considerably across the HN society, and may be heavily contested. In some cases, disputes over cultural traditions may be an element of the root causes of the

insurgency or part of the narrative insurgents craft to mobilize support. Service forces should receive appropriate cultural awareness training before joining COIN operations. A wide variety of culture training and education offerings have been produced by Service culture centers (the US Army Training and Doctrine Command Culture Center; the Navy Center for Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture; the Air Force Culture and Language Center; and the Marine Corps Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning). These centers are supported by the Defense Language and National Security Education Office, which manages a Web site listing links to all of these resources (www.cultureready.org).

(2) **Understanding HN Partners.** While improving the capacity of the HN government to control its territory and population is key, addressing the core grievances is also necessary to end the insurgency. External counterinsurgents will often have to cajole or coerce HN governments and entrenched elites to recognize the potential legitimacy of those grievances and address them. Reforms that threaten the political and financial interests of those elites are most likely to generate resistance. Therefore, external counterinsurgents have to put as much effort into understanding and shaping the behavior of their HN partners as they do into countering the insurgents. This typically requires a critical assessment of the motivations and interests of factions and individuals within the HN government.

(3) **Prepare for a Long-Term Commitment.** Insurgencies are protracted conflicts by nature. History demonstrates that they often last for years or even decades. Thus, COIN normally demands considerable expenditures of time and resources, especially if they should be conducted simultaneously with operations in a protracted war combining traditional warfare and IW. The relevant population may prefer the HN government to the insurgents; however, people do not actively support a government unless they are convinced the counterinsurgents possess credibility and have the means, ability, stamina, and will to win. The insurgents' primary battle is against the HN government, not the US; however, US support can be crucial to building public faith in that government's viability. The population should have confidence in the staying power of both the US counterinsurgents and the HN government. Insurgents and the relevant population often believe a few casualties or a few years will cause the USG to abandon COIN. Constant reaffirmations of commitment, backed by deeds, can overcome that perception and bolster US credibility. Even the strongest US commitment, however, will not succeed if the population does not perceive the HN government as having similar credibility. US forces should help create crucial HN capabilities and capacities, and overcome weaknesses, to sustain the HN's credibility and legitimacy. It is also important to note, USG support to HN's COIN can decrease or even cease while the HN's COIN are still fighting the insurgency. This could normally happen due to a change in the US position, lack of public support (both within the US and abroad) or increased capability of the HN to fight its own COIN without US support.

(4) **Preparation.** Preparing for protracted COIN requires establishing a headquarters and support structure designed for long-term operations, including detention options, even if the USG COIN force uses a small footprint. Planning and commitments should be based on sustainable operating tempo and personnel tempo limits for the various components of the force. Even in situations where the USG objective is reducing its

military force levels as quickly as possible, some support for HN institutions usually remains for a long time, particularly in partnerships, outreach, and civil-military affairs. US preparatory actions for long-term support should come at the public request of the HN and be focused on supporting IDAD.

(5) **US Public Support.** US public opinion should be considered as part of the OE, just as the indigenous population opinion is essential to COIN, because USG COIN efforts should prove worthwhile to the US public. At the national strategic level, gaining and maintaining US public support for a protracted deployment is critical. Demonstrating incremental success is essential to maintaining support.

(6) **Learn and Adapt.** Counterinsurgents should further develop situational awareness of the OE as the COIN operation is planned, executed, and assessed. Counterinsurgents should assess and adjust the operation's plan throughout the operations to maintain initiative and operate within the enemy's decision cycle. Most of the successful COIN operations or campaigns, historically speaking, stress the need for military forces being learning organizations that are able to make quick adaptations to changes in the OE.

b. **Develop the COIN Narrative.** Fulfilling military objectives is only part of COIN: the key is to demonstrate to the relevant population that the HN government and its allies are not only winning, but their cause is just and irresistible. This is accomplished through the development of a COIN narrative to overwhelm the insurgency narrative. The COIN narrative should contextualize what the population experiences, legitimizing counterinsurgent actions and delegitimizing the insurgency. It is an interpretive lens designed to help individuals and groups make decisions in the face of uncertainty where the stakes are perceived as life and death. The COIN narrative should explain the current situation and describe how the HN government will defeat the insurgency. It should invoke relevant cultural and historical references to both justify the actions of counterinsurgents and make the case that the government will win.

(1) The COIN narrative provides an operational framework for integrating all relevant information with the range of military and civilian activities to shape the perception of the insurgents and the population. The COIN narrative operationalizes the concept of "propaganda of the deed" to leverage the cumulative and enduring effects of each action. Actions signal intentions and indicate credibility to follow through on promises and threats; they constitute a critical form of communication to local audiences. Every action takes on a symbolic meaning that is interpreted through the lens of the narrative. Simply assuming counterinsurgent actions will be interpreted the way they were intended leaves them vulnerable to misinterpretation or deliberate distortion by insurgents. Conversely, intentional exploitation of this phenomenon can magnify the impact of counterinsurgent actions on the population and the insurgency.

(2) The COIN narrative should be based on the counterinsurgents' political-military strategy and be developed in conjunction with the military operational approach. The COIN narrative should help units and any civilian partners interpret operational-level guidance and select the most appropriate tools and methods to address specific local-level COIN challenges. Choosing approaches that are both effective at solving the immediate

challenge and consistent with COIN narrative helps ensure tactical successes amount to more than the sum of their parts, shaping the perceptions of insurgents and population and achieving operational objectives over time.

(3) US forces committed to supporting COIN are there to assist an HN government. The long-term objective is to leave a government able to stand by itself, which is also normally the objective even if the US begins COIN in an area that does not have an HN government. Regardless of the starting conditions, the HN ultimately has to win on its own. Achieving this requires development of viable local leaders and institutions. US forces and USG departments and agencies can help, but HN elements should accept responsibilities to achieve real victory. While it may be easier for joint forces to conduct operations themselves, it is better to work to strengthen local forces and institutions and then assist them. HN governments have the final responsibility to solve their own problems. Eventually all foreign armies are seen as interlopers or occupiers; the sooner the main effort can transition to HN institutions, without unacceptable degradation, the better.

(4) **Manage Expectations.** The US and its HN partners should take steps to proactively manage the expectations of the local population and other relevant actors. This process involves encouraging and reinforcing reasonable expectations, setting counterinsurgents up for success when they prove able to deliver on promises. Counterinsurgents trying to build enthusiasm for their efforts should avoid making unrealistic promises. At best, a failure to deliver promised results may undermine the credibility of the counterinsurgents and at worst be interpreted as deliberate deception rather than good intentions gone awry. Conversely, consistently meeting reasonable expectations can increase the population's patience with the inevitable inconveniences and uneven progress typical in COIN operations. Due to troop rotation policies of the Services, commanders should be wary of assuming current objectives will remain consistent with incoming units or commanders.

c. **Primacy of Politics.** At the beginning of a COIN operation, military actions may appear predominant as security forces conduct operations to secure the populace and kill, capture, or influence insurgents. However, USG strategic objectives and HN political objectives guide the COIN approach. Commanders should consider how operations contribute to strengthening the HN government's legitimacy and achieving US objectives—the latter is especially important if the HN is very weak or ineffective. This means political and diplomatic leaders should actively participate through all aspects (planning, preparation, execution, and assessment) of COIN. The political and military aspects of insurgencies are so bound together as to be inseparable. Resolving most insurgencies requires a political solution, whether or not facilitated by significant military activities. Moreover, most insurgency solutions involve some sort of political compromise rather than a strictly "winner take all" situation. In COIN, the relationship between military operations and achieving HN political objectives is more complicated than in traditional warfare. Traditional adversaries invest in building conventional military capabilities that are distinct from the population and take significant time and effort to regenerate if destroyed. In contrast, the low resource requirements of insurgent groups allow them to generate military strength directly through mobilization of segments of the population. If

the root causes of the insurgency—the opportunity, motive, and means—are left unaddressed or are exacerbated by combat operations, insurgent forces often prove able to regenerate or even expand their political appeal and military strength. Consequently, counterinsurgent military operations should be carefully planned to support the political strategy at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels. COIN often requires a mixture of aggressive activities that create lethal effects to degrade insurgent capabilities and disrupt insurgent networks and other activities to begin addressing core grievances. However, all efforts should be guided primarily by their potential to influence the perceptions of the insurgents and the population. In COIN, both the objectives and the way they are achieved affect the perceptions of the population: actions executed without properly assessing their effects at best result in reduced effectiveness and at worst are counterproductive. Therefore, strategic considerations inform all aspects of operational art, including the prioritization and sequencing of operations, the employment of forces, and guidance regarding TTP. Avoid excessive collateral damage and disproportionate use of force. The COIN force needs to avoid collective punishment of the population within the contested area and escalating repression. Forces that use coercion and intimidation are placed at an operational disadvantage. As the OE changes, so should the operational approach.

d. **Population Security.** A key concern for the population caught in the midst of an insurgency is security. Providing security to the population is the foundation for all other efforts and a prerequisite for lasting stability. Civilians tend to cooperate with whichever side proves capable of providing a predictable and acceptable environment. Although the factors that constitute predictable and acceptable conditions vary across different contexts and societies—and may vary within the operational area—they boil down to a clear set of rules that are consistently enforced under which the population feels it can live. In many cases, civilians will cooperate with the side that establishes effective control over their area even if it contradicts their political preferences. However, understanding and addressing the population’s security concerns can prove challenging.

(1) **Human Security and Prioritization.** To effectively provide security to the population, the concept of security has to be expanded beyond the suppression of insurgent activity and protection from physical violence and intimidation, to include the full range of issues affecting individual and community life. While physical security is the first priority, other critical factors can include access to dispute resolution, the protection of human rights, access to critical community resources (migration routes, grazing land), and access to essential services. The expectations and priorities of the population define which factors are relevant and what constitutes acceptable conditions, not Western standards or assumptions. Those expectations may vary enormously across different parts of the operational area or the population (urban versus rural areas; mining communities versus nomads). Providing human security should be integral to efforts to expand HN control at the local level.

(2) **Physical Security.** Insurgent violence against the population shapes the population’s behavior in three key ways. It undermines the government’s credibility and legitimacy as a provider of security in return for cooperation, it isolates the population from the government by punishing those seen to be collaborating, and it establishes a rival system of control/governance over the civilian population. If insurgents are able to

establish a more credible and consistently enforced set of rules than the government, the population is more likely to cooperate irrespective of whether they agree with the insurgents' goals. Since insurgents require secrecy, anonymity can be stripped from key persons of interest via the application of biometrics and biometrics-enabled intelligence. Thus, it is critical the COIN force provide adequate levels of security for the population to retain its support and cooperation. Those efforts should align with the overall political-military strategy, but to be effective they should address the full range of security concerns of the population, which may extend well beyond the insurgents and not be captured in standard military threat assessments. Particularly where the HN government or security forces have a history of human rights violations, or insurgent violence has effectively intimidated the populace into silence, COIN forces should make a concerted effort to understand how the population perceives the security environment and how to address those violations if ongoing.

(a) COIN forces may be a source of insecurity for the population as well. There is balance to be struck between two competing objectives: being as close as feasible to the population to bring security and ensuring such proximity does not have the unintended effect of endangering the population by placing a military objective in their midst. Abusive, corrupt, or predatory behavior by elements of the security forces can taint the entire COIN operation, undermine the legitimacy of the HN government, and push the population to support the insurgency. This is particularly true if the population interprets such abuses as evidence of a broader struggle for survival between different identity groups. Even one or two incidents, if captured in video or as still images, can undermine the entire COIN strategic narrative. In such cases, abuses have the potential to inflame a security dilemma and play into the insurgency narrative.

(b) The perception of legitimacy with respect to the use of force is also important. If the HN police have a reasonable reputation for competence and impartiality, it is better for them to execute urban raids, as the population is likely to view that application of force as more legitimate than military action. When police, who are usually lightly armed, are outgunned by insurgents who may have heavy automatic weapons or rocket propelled grenades, consideration has to be made to arm and train them on those weapons and the lawful use of force or conduct the raid in concert with trained military forces. However, local circumstances affect this decision. If the police are seen as part of an ethnic or sectarian group oppressing the general population, their use may be counterproductive. Effective counterinsurgents thus understand the character of the local police and popular perceptions of both police and military units. This understanding helps ensure the application of force is appropriate and reinforces the rule of law.

(3) **Administration of Justice and Rule of Law.** Access to effective mechanisms to resolve disputes with fellow citizens and with governing authorities without resorting to violence and in accordance with a consistent set of rules is fundamental to ensure the population feels secure. To limit the negative impact of abuses of power, the rule of law should govern the conduct of COIN forces, transparently and consistently following its own rules. There are three “sets” of laws that should be considered: international, HN, and US. Access to legal recourse should be provided to citizens who feel that the government has wronged them. Forces that do not abide by the rule of law

risk creating additional insecurity and fear among the population, as well as feeding the insurgency narratives. Commanders need to be aware there may be local customs or traditions that serve local populations as “laws” but are actually outside the HN legal constructs. Taliban use of strict interpretation of sharia law is an example of this.

(4) **Legal System.** Effective legal and governance systems deemed legitimate in the eyes of the local population may differ greatly from Western models and may vary across the operational area (e.g., the capital city versus remote rural areas). JFCs should endeavor to support locally appropriate systems while adhering to US and international human rights standards. Legitimacy, however, requires the legal system be reasonably free from corruption and bias, accessible to all citizens, and provide consistent and predictable outcomes.

(5) **Rules of Engagement (ROE).** Even carefully targeted military operations against insurgents can create risks for the population. The security of the population may require offensive operations against insurgents to seize the initiative and neutralize the threat. In some contexts, populations have proven tolerant of increased civilian casualties as a result of aggressive offensive operations against insurgents when those operations helped produce a significant overall improvement in civil security. In other contexts, every civilian casualty resulting from COIN operations has undermined support for the government and its allies. COIN forces should carefully assess the political, cultural, and security context through the eyes of the population to develop an effective approach to managing this dilemma. Normally, counterinsurgents can use ROE to minimize potential loss of life. The ability to send the right message is often as important as the ability to create lethal effects. ROE should address lesser means of force when such use is likely to create the desired nonlethal effects, and joint forces can do so without endangering themselves, others, or mission accomplishment. Escalation of force procedures should be developed as part of ROE and the inherent right of self-defense. Commanders should provide training on the rules for the use of force and ROE. Any use of force must be executed with consideration for consequent effects. Overwhelming effort may prove necessary to destroy an opponent, especially extremist insurgent combatants. However, counterinsurgents, in accordance with ROE, should carefully calculate the type and amount of force and who applies it, regardless of the means of applying force. An operation that kills five insurgents is counterproductive if collateral damage leads to the recruitment of 50 more insurgents and the loss of local support. Thus, careful targeting is required to weigh the legal framework; the potential effects; and the perceptions of the relevant population, the US population, the multinational partner populations, and international opinion.

(6) **Isolate the Insurgency.** Insurgents should be isolated from the population, their cause, and support. While it may be necessary to kill or capture insurgents, it is more effective in the long run to separate an insurgency from the population and its resources, thus letting it die. Confrontational military action, in exclusion, is counterproductive in most cases; it risks generating popular resentment, creating martyrs that motivate new recruits, and producing cycles of revenge. As the HN government increases its legitimacy, the populace begins to assist it more actively. Eventually, the people marginalize and stigmatize insurgents to the point that the insurgency’s claim to legitimacy is diminished.

(a) **Expropriating the Insurgent Cause.** Skillful counterinsurgents can deal a significant blow to an insurgency by expropriating its cause. Insurgents often exploit multiple causes, making counterinsurgents' challenges more difficult. In the end, any successful COIN operation should address the grievances insurgents exploit to generate popular support. These may be different in each local area, in which case a complex set of solutions will be needed. A mix of usurpation and direct refutation may also be used. Counterinsurgents may champion portions of the insurgents' cause while directly refuting others. This approach may be especially useful when stated insurgent goals are clearly disproportionately beneficial to one group. Counterinsurgents may be able to also "capture" an insurgency's cause and exploit it. For example, an insurgent ideology based on an extremist interpretation of a holy text can be countered by appealing to a moderate interpretation of the same text. When a credible religious or other respected leader passes this kind of message, the counteraction is even more effective.

(b) **Cutting Logistics.** Counterinsurgents should cut off the flow of arms and ammunition into the area and eliminate their sources. An effective weapon in denying logistics to an insurgency is resource control. Resource control is normally the responsibility of the indigenous civil governments, but can be done by US forces. Resource control regulates the movement or consumption of military materiel resources, mobilizes materiel resources, and denies military materiel to the enemy. It is used during times of civil or military emergency, but should not disrupt essential services and have the minimum possible impact on the civilian population, including for those living in territory controlled by the insurgents.

(c) **Reducing Finances.** Counterinsurgents can exploit insurgent financial weaknesses. Controls and regulations that limit the movement and exchange of military materiel and funds may compound insurgent financial vulnerabilities. These counters are especially effective when an insurgency receives funding from outside the affected nation. Additionally, effective law enforcement can be detrimental to an insurgency that uses criminal means for funding. Department of the Treasury designations and other diplomatic tools outside the scope of DOD are key to counter threat finance (CTF). US forces support CTF with military analysts trained in CTF or threat finance intelligence (TFI). The JFC should work closely with the COM to identify and target threat finance sources and may even consider the creation of an interagency threat finance cell (TFC) to enhance the collection, analysis, and dissemination of intelligence to support and strengthen US, multinational, and HN efforts to disrupt and eliminate key insurgent financial network nodes.

(d) **Synchronize and Integrate Lines of Effort (LOEs).** In COIN, activities that affect PMESII systems in the OE cannot be planned and implemented in isolation. They are carefully synchronized at the operational and tactical levels to reinforce each other and support the COIN narrative. From planning through execution, the efforts of joint interagency, multinational, and HN participants are integrated toward a common purpose. Insurgent opportunities, motives, and means typically cut across LOEs, so failure to integrate LOEs will at best render COIN less effective and at worst lead to counterproductive impacts across different LOEs. Counterinsurgents will, therefore, have

to prioritize efforts while remaining cognizant of the linkages and effects these operations will have in other areas.

e. **Unity of Command and Unity of Effort**

(1) **Unity of Command.** Military unity of command is the preferred method for achieving unity of effort in any military operation. Military unity of command is achieved by establishing and maintaining formal command or support relationships. Unity of command should extend to all military forces conducting COIN (US, HN, and other multinational forces). The purpose of command relationships is for military forces, police, and other security forces to establish effective control while attaining a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence within the society.

(2) **Unity of Effort.** Many participants in COIN may not be subject to unity of command, so unity of effort should be present at every echelon of a COIN operation. Otherwise, well-intentioned but uncoordinated actions can conflict or provide vulnerabilities for insurgents to exploit. JFCs work to achieve unified action through liaison and interorganizational coordination with the leaders of a wide variety of government and multinational agencies, including those of the HN and the US. Whether there is a single chain of command or not, there should be a single mission, which is COIN. The military contribution to COIN is coordinated with the activities of USG interagency partners, the operations of multinational forces, and activities of various HN agencies (to the extent they are all participants in the COIN operation) to be successful. Nongovernmental organization (NGO) activities most likely will not be integrated with military plans. It is generally preferable from a planning perspective to assign military actors with a security mission and civilian actors with a governance and development mission.

For further details on US military and NGO relations, see Guidelines for Relations Between US Armed Forces and Non-Governmental Humanitarian Organizations in Hostile and Potentially Hostile Environments.

(3) **Coordination with NGOs.** Governmental participants in COIN will likely need to coordinate with NGOs. Most NGOs will not allow their activities to be integrated with military plans to maintain impartiality and independence in their operations, acceptance for their role among the conflict-affected population, and the ability to operate securely.

(4) **Intelligence Drives Operations.** Effective COIN is enabled by timely and reliable intelligence, gathered and analyzed at all levels and disseminated throughout the force. A cycle develops where operations produce intelligence that contribute to the conduct of subsequent operations. Reporting by units, members of the country team, and information derived from interactions with civilian agencies is often of equal or greater importance than reporting by specialized intelligence assets. The need to generate a favorable operational tempo drives the requirement to produce and disseminate intelligence at the lowest practical level. Commanders should establish organizational architectures that provide operations-intelligence fusion at the lowest possible tactical level with

analytical capacity as far forward as possible, so the analyst is close—in time and space—to the supported commander.

4. United States Government Activities

a. **Context for USG Involvement in COIN.** The context for US involvement in COIN is based on three possible strategic settings: assisting an established HN government, as an adjunct to US major combat operations, or US operations in a UGA. Support for an existing government is the most common and constitutes one variety of FID, in which US policy makers and the HN government can jointly decide on the appropriate level of US involvement through the development of an IDAD strategy. Depending upon the strength and effectiveness of capabilities available to the affected government, the USG may play a subtle role in countering an incipient insurgency or may intervene more forcefully. The USG selects the most appropriate, most indirect, and least intrusive form of intervention that will attain the desired end state and protect the sovereignty of the HN government. It is often the case that the less intrusive and more indirect the approach selected, the more likely it is to succeed, though this may depend on the maturity of the insurgency. An incipient insurgency can often be more easily addressed by a small-scale US response with greater emphasis on nonmilitary US resources than a mature insurgency. However, most affected nations will only seek US assistance when the insurgency has developed sufficient maturity to pose a real threat, by which time the smaller scale response options may no longer be effective. Where USG COIN follow major combat operations or occur in a UGA, US forces will typically be the only ones available to conduct combat operations, and the joint force may be called upon to play a role in governance and civil administration until civilian counterparts can deploy or a new, indigenous government can be established.

For additional information, refer to Appendix A, “Building Governance.”

b. **Types of USG Involvement.** USG involvement can take the form of indirect support, direct support without combat operations, or US combat operations. A variety of tools and approaches are available for each level of involvement and can be mixed and matched to suit the specific challenges of each insurgency. An expert advisor, who may be either a civilian or a military officer, could be sent directly to the staff of the HN government. One is most successful when the selected advisor possesses cultural and language skills appropriate to the HN, is paired with an effective indigenous leadership team, and can deploy for an extended period of time.

(1) **Indirect Support.** This approach emphasizes HN self-sufficiency and focuses on building strong national infrastructures through economic and military capabilities. Indirect support is typically implemented through the existing US country team, sometimes augmented through the deployment of a team of specialists with relevant expertise. The military component of SA, implemented by DOD in accordance with policies established by the Department of State (DOS), has as its principal components foreign military financing program, international military education and training, and foreign military sales.

(2) **Direct Support Not Involving Combat Operations.** Under this approach, the US personnel are directly providing assistance to the HN civil administration, security forces, and/or civilian populace. Direct support operations are normally conducted when the HN can maintain self-sufficiency and is faced with social, economic, or military threats beyond its capability to handle. Assistance may take the form of SFA, direct participation in civil-military operations (CMO) (primarily, the provision of services to the local populace), military information support operations (MISO), communications and intelligence cooperation, mobility, and logistic support. In some cases, the provision of new equipment may be authorized as well. The scale of direct support can vary considerably, ranging from a single expert advisor seconded to the HN government, to an extensive training program for HNSF, to embedded mentors that advise HN government personnel in the field. In some forms, direct support may remain low-profile and small footprint, while in others US involvement will be clearly evident and carry with it the risks and challenges more commonly associated with a large footprint approach.

(3) **US Combat Operations.** The introduction of US combat forces requires a Presidential decision, and—in the context of support to an existing HN government—demands careful assessment of the benefits and tradeoffs to COIN and US strategic objectives. In some cases, US forces may be engaged in combat operations while acting as embedded advisors to HNSF. Combined action represents the next level of involvement, in which US personnel are joined with HN personnel to operate as a single combat formation, typically a platoon or a company. US forces may conduct operations in coordination with HNSF or constitute the main COIN force where no HN government is present. Depending on the scale of involvement, the role of US forces in relation to the insurgency, the population, and the number of US personnel deployed, participation in combat operations may fall into either the small footprint or large footprint category.

(4) **SC.** This is the broad, more encompassing approach to HN internal threats. It begins with SC activities and, if required, advances through the first two categories of a USG FID program, direct support, and indirect support, respectively, for HN COIN. Although beyond the scope of SC, a calculated transition to the third category of FID (i.e., US combat operations) may be required if the threat becomes overwhelming for the HN and if approved by the President.

For a more detailed discussion of the FID aspects of SC, refer to Chapter V, “Planning.”

(5) **Crisis Response Direct Intervention.** Direct intervention in a COIN operation or campaign would be the initial involvement by US combat operations as the result of a crisis response, not a transition through a FID program. This would be the least favored requirement for intervention. The campaigns in Iraq and Afghanistan were not standard examples of direct COIN intervention, since forces were initially deployed to bring about regime change, and there was no progressive FID program.

c. **Challenges for USG Involvement in COIN.** When analyzing the situation and considering an approach for the COA, it should be remembered that every insurgency is different and will require a carefully tailored response. The approaches outlined above should, therefore, be seen as broad categories and not specific models and largely based on

the needs and sensitivities of the HN to foreign intervention. There is a tendency for FID and COIN assistance to creep incrementally from small scale and less intrusive forms to ever larger and more obvious assistance. This is clearly illustrated by the history of US involvement in Vietnam, Iraq, and Afghanistan. The danger of this type of escalation is that the in-depth assessment and policy evaluation that occurred for the initial decision to assist may not necessarily be repeated for every increment, and the government may find itself enmeshed in a scale of effort which was not reached by logical deliberation. Because of the protracted nature of COIN operations, the possibility of escalatory involvement should be a major consideration during the formulation of the CONOPS. If the assessment of the situation is thorough enough and accurate, then the level of involvement chosen should be sufficient to address the problem. However, more often than not, US policy makers significantly underestimate the scale of effort required to defeat an insurgency. If escalation of involvement is required, it should be anticipated that a full reassessment of the situation and a strategic policy decision might be required prior to a major increase of involvement.

d. As outsiders seeking to shape the politics of a foreign society and foster legitimate and effective local governance, the US will be involved in COIN as a third party. Third-party counterinsurgents face a series of challenges in addition to those inherent to COIN. Those challenges manifest themselves in different ways and to different degrees depending on the scale of the US presence and its political and security role.

(1) **Understanding the Conflict.** Insurgencies reflect the specific social, economic, cultural, political, historical, and geographic context of the society in which they are fought. Understanding the nuances and interrelationships of these factors—how they coalesce into opportunity, motive, and means—represents a fundamental challenge for outsiders. The existence of an insurgency powerful enough to warrant support from other nations suggests that even the HN government may not have an accurate understanding of its own society. For third-party counterinsurgents, understanding all the dimensions of the conflict, how it varies across the OE, and what constitutes a realistic political-military strategy to foster durable stability represents a recurring challenge.

Refer to Chapter II, “Insurgency,” and Chapter IV, “The Operational Environment,” for additional discussion regarding the OE.

(2) **Willingness of the HN to Reform.** Whether acting in support of an existing HN government or seeking to establish a new legitimate political authority, third-party counterinsurgents rely on local partners to assume responsibility for governance. While improving the capacity of the HN government to control its territory and population is key, addressing the core grievances is also necessary to end the insurgency. US counterinsurgents will often have to cajole or coerce HN governments and entrenched elites to recognize and address those grievances. This is especially true where reforms would involve compromising the political and financial interests of those elites. This typically requires a critical assessment of the motivations and interests of factions and individuals within the HN government and their connections to elements of the broader HN society.

(3) **External Assistance as a Source of Corruption.** HN government corruption is often a root cause of insurgency. Government corruption could potentially be linked to reliance of the HN government on revenue from either licit or illicit sources. Reliance on external sources of revenue undermines the relationship between the government and the population and turns the state into a source of private profit for those in power. This pattern typically results in poor governance, gross income inequality, and abusive security forces. Additional assistance provided by US counterinsurgents can unintentionally exacerbate this pattern by reinforcing the dependency of the HN government on outsiders to maintain control. Spending by external counterinsurgents seeking to foster stability can actually insulate the HN government from pressure to reform or even encourage further corruption and abuses by creating perverse incentives. Reliance on international contractors can have the unintended effects of creating an inflated or dependent economy, which almost by its nature invites corruption, of retarding HN government capacity building, and of creating exorbitant inflation in the local market. US counterinsurgents should carefully calibrate civil and military assistance programs to ensure they are having the desired political impact while focusing assistance programs on only the critical issues driving the insurgency. Long-term development challenges are best addressed once the conflict is resolved.

(4) **Legitimacy of Outside Interveners and Usurpation of Sovereignty.** Beyond relations with the HN government, US counterinsurgents also have to consider their legitimacy among the HN population. The initial legitimacy of US counterinsurgents varies depending on the nature of the conflict. Traditionally, however, outsiders are vulnerable to allegations of exploitation, oppression, profiteering, or neo-colonialism. If the population perceives the US actions as illegitimate, this perception may taint the HN government by association. Conversely, support for an abusive HN government can damage the legitimacy of the US, undermining its ability to sustain support to the COIN. Low legitimacy also constrains the political freedom of action of US counterinsurgents, making them more dependent on the HN government and less able to apply pressure for necessary reforms. These risks can be mitigated through the scale and form of involvement, but US counterinsurgents should consider how to maintain and build their legitimacy among the HN population as a challenge distinct from, but interrelated with, building the legitimacy of the HN government. Further, the long-term presence of foreign forces, to include the US, could be interpreted by the indigenous population as a loss of sovereignty. If the US presence overstays its welcome, the HN government might be perceived by the population as subservient to the US, no matter how much time, effort, and resources the JFC and civilian authorities put into reinforcing the legitimacy of the HN government. Rather, it will be perceived as a puppet government, and the commander of the foreign forces will be perceived as the true sovereign power.

(5) **Responsibility for HN Government Actions.** A fundamental dilemma of US counterinsurgents is being held responsible for the conduct of HN partners that the US counterinsurgent does not control. HN governments face insurgencies because state institutions are ineffective at meeting the population's needs or are outright abusive. In many cases, that behavior reflects deeply rooted problems with the nature of the HN government. It takes time to address those problems, even with the support of third-party counterinsurgents, while both military and civil assistance can be used in ways that third-party counterinsurgents did not intend. However, the HN population, the media, the

international community, and the US population will hold the USG responsible for the actions of the HN partners that the US supports. This creates a risk that should be carefully accounted for during planning, and mitigation should be developed to prevent and respond to incidents of abuse by HN partners. Such mitigation should include both remedial action and clear messaging, especially to the local population. HN populations may interpret a lack of public reaction by US counterinsurgents to misbehavior by HN partners as an endorsement of such abuses.

e. Challenges of Small Footprint Approach

(1) **Limited Access to HN Population.** Small footprint approaches also have drawbacks. Chief among them can be the dependence on the HN government for access to the population. HN governments will often seek to portray insurgents as criminals or terrorists and their grievances as fabrications. In some instances, HN governments may seek to restrict US access to credible voices of popular dissent by actively or passively limiting the mobility of US personnel on the ground. Moreover, the population may not trust HNSF with a history of human rights abuses or perceived sectarian bias to protect them, making it difficult to counter insurgent intimidation and shadow governance. Nonlethal tactics may reduce the number of casualties associated with excessive use of force, limit reconstruction costs, and maintain the trust of the local populace.

(2) **Limited Knowledge, Oversight, and Mentoring.** HN government reporting often presents a distorted picture of the situation. While small footprint approaches have advantages, the limited number of US personnel in the operational area can make it difficult to gather sufficient information for an independent assessment. Understanding HN government decision making and monitoring its conduct—especially when employing assistance—can prove a challenge with limited personnel. Moreover, embedded mentors are often critical to ensure HNSF behave professionally and adhere to US-provided COIN training, particularly on the use of force, while conducting operations. When planning for small footprint approaches to COIN, JFCs should consider how many personnel will be required to ensure an accurate assessment of the situation and that US assistance is having the intended political-military effects.

(3) **Limited Combat Capability and Influence over Security Forces.** In some COIN operations, HNSF might be more of a threat to the civilian population than the insurgent forces. Their limited combat capability allows insurgents to seize and retain the initiative, while abuses against the civilian population validate the insurgency narrative and widen its support. Where local forces are in the lead, experience has shown that embedded mentors are often critical to ensure HNSF adhere to US-provided training in COIN while conducting operations. In extreme cases, the perceived or real drawbacks of HNSF in the eyes of the population may make them an impediment rather than asset to COIN in some parts of the operational area. In those circumstances, JFCs employing a small footprint approach will have to develop alternative/interim approaches to securing communities against insurgent violence.

f. **Challenges of Large Footprint Approach.** Joint forces may conduct COIN with a large ground presence in situations where there is no HN government, such as in a UGA,

or in conjunction with an occupation as part of a larger regime change operation authorized by the United Nations (UN) Security Council, if resistance arises, or at the invitation of an HN government.

(1) **Occupation.** In the case of an occupation, the law of war requires the occupying force to provide military governance to the local population. International law is clear in regards to the responsibilities of the occupying power—it should provide security to the local population; it should ensure access to essential services, and it should enforce local laws, unless those laws are contrary to the law of war or internationally recognized human rights principles. Although some segments of the local population may view the regime change as a liberation, certain other segments of the population may view the operation as a hostile invasion. From the counterinsurgent’s perspective, whether the local population views the operation as a liberation or not, the law of war responsibilities of an occupying power still apply.

(2) **Enhancement of Insurgency Narrative.** The extended presence of large numbers of foreign forces can feed the insurgency narrative claiming an illegitimate occupation, create suspicions of neo-colonialism, and lead to conspiracy theories regarding the true intentions of the foreign forces.

(3) **Distortive Effect on HNSF.** A large foreign ground force can inhibit the development of HNSF by assuming too many responsibilities, by attempting to train local forces to standards that are unachievable in the local context, by using weapons and equipment that are too sophisticated for the local context, and by providing salaries and resources to local forces that are unsustainable over the long term.

g. **Strategy and Operational Art in COIN.** During the planning process, JFCs should carefully assess the OE, the nature of the challenge, and the strategic context for US involvement. This will typically involve a more detailed analysis of the situation at the operational and tactical levels than those undertaken at strategic and policy levels. In considering how ends, ways, and means can be aligned to attain the US strategic end state, JFCs should assess whether US strategic assumptions accurately reflect the situation at the operational and tactical level. Where a disconnect is evident, JFCs should coordinate with strategic and policy leaders to share their assessment of the challenge and request clarification or reconsideration of strategic guidance. Many elements of COIN are ultimately local; JFCs should ensure strategic and policy leaders understand the limits of any operational approach to generate lasting stability if the political strategy does not account for the realities of politics in the operational area.

5. Operational Approaches

The operational approach is a commander’s description of the broad actions the force should take to attain the desired military end state. The commander may use direct or indirect approaches, or a mixture of both, to contend with the insurgency’s COG. A direct approach attacks the enemy’s COG or principal strength by applying combat power directly against it. An indirect approach attacks the enemy’s COG by applying power against a series of decisive points that lead to the defeat of the COG while avoiding the

enemy strength. Commanders may use a single direct or indirect approach or, more likely, may employ a combination of approaches to counter an insurgency and its influence. The operational approach is largely based on the JFC's understanding of the OE and the nature of the insurgency. Successful development of the operational approach requires continuous analysis, learning, assessment, dialogue, and collaboration between commander and staff, as well as other subject matter experts including other interagency and multinational partners in unified action.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

COIN is a USG effort requiring interagency coordination that is normally led by a DOS COM in support of the HN government. For USG support to HN COIN, the COM is normally the senior USG representative.

a. **Military.** While nonmilitary considerations are paramount for long-term success in COIN, the joint military contribution is essential to provide security and other support that enables other interagency partners' COIN and allows progression. Joint forces contribute to unified action through unity of command and a C2 architecture that integrates strategic, operational, and tactical organizations and synchronizes or deconflicts their tasks and activities. Services play a key role in both stability actions and countering insurgency, and their efforts are most effective when synchronized. The JFC should coordinate with and draw on the capabilities of separate agencies, as well as provide support, especially security, as required by other participants. To the extent that multinational forces are assigned to the JFC, the JFC is responsible for integration of those forces into COIN in accordance with any national caveats associated with those forces. Caveats are restrictions upon the use of their forces which are imposed by the governments of PNs.

b. **USG Departments and Agencies.** Interagency coordination is conducted among departments and agencies of the USG, including DOD, for the purpose of achieving an objective. In COIN, interagency coordination among the joint force and USG interagency partners is fundamental, because they, in turn, will likely coordinate with other non-US participants.

c. **International.** Coordination with international organizations involves the USG, led by DOS, in conjunction with the JFC, and implemented through the relevant COM and country team, working with the HN. In some cases, the HN, in conjunction with the COM and JFC, may coordinate with the international organizations. When working with international organizations, the JFC should use existing mechanisms of the COM and country team, DOS, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and other appropriate agencies. International organizations provide leadership, capabilities, and mandate. They may lend legitimacy and credibility to governance, especially for the HN. Interorganizational coordination includes coordination with international organizations.

d. **Multinational.** When working with alliance and coalition partners, the JFC should use existing mechanisms of the COM and country team, DOS, USAID, and other appropriate agencies and establish organizational relationships as close to command

relationships as possible with the multinational forces. There have been occasions where the JFC was designated the multinational force commander but did not have unity of command over the multinational force. In this case, the JFC will establish organizational relationships that result in unity of effort. The HN is the most important entity for multinational coordination in COIN. As with any multinational effort, trust and agreement bind the entities conducting COIN on common objectives, which is especially important between the HN and the remainder of the multinational forces. Language and cultural differences often present the most immediate challenge. All actors should strive to overcome these challenges through communication and improving cultural awareness. Liaisons and advisors can play a vital role in these areas. Multinational forces should remember they are present at the request of the HN, and COIN is ultimately the HN's responsibility. Together, the JFC and COM should enable leaders of US contingents to establish robust organizational relationships to work closely with their multinational counterparts while becoming familiar with and coordinating with agencies that may operate in their operational area. To the degree possible, military leaders should use military liaison personnel to further enable appropriate relationships and the awareness between joint forces and their multinational and HN counterparts. Interorganizational coordination includes coordination with alliance and coalition partners.

e. Nongovernmental

(1) Coordination with NGOs occurs with various elements of the USG, implemented through the relevant COM and country team, to achieve an objective. When working with NGOs, the JFC should use existing mechanisms of the COM and country team, DOS, USAID, and other appropriate agencies. Absent a COM, a JFC may have to directly coordinate with NGOs, multinational corporations, and contractors until a US diplomatic mission is established. This can be facilitated by reachback through the GCC to relevant USG departments or agencies and through the use of civil-military operations centers (CMOCs). The preponderance of effort put forth by the joint task force (JTF) will continue to focus on creating the security conditions necessary to support the civilian administration of the HN government and establish the US diplomatic mission. Interorganizational coordination includes coordination with NGOs. Where USAID has an established presence in the HN, it will maintain a system for vetting legitimate local NGOs, thus the JFC should consult with USAID prior to planning to partner with NGOs to confirm their legitimacy.

(2) Many NGOs will not wish to openly associate with the joint force as an overt association with the military can give the perception that they are a partner in COIN, making them less effective or subject to insurgent attack. Collaborating and coordinating with those NGOs can be difficult, however, establishing basic awareness of these groups and their activities is important because they play important roles assisting in resolution of insurgencies, providing humanitarian assistance (HA), and supporting stability. Try to build a complementary, trust-based relationship regardless of the NGOs level of cooperation. The JFC may have an obligation under international law to ensure the security of NGOs to the extent that the NGO will allow. Commanders should also be aware that some illegal and potentially adversarial organizations will attempt to claim status as an NGO.

(3) Many civilian HA providers view security differently than the joint force. In fact, the HA community has an entirely different security paradigm than the joint force. For HA providers, security is based on belligerent perception of the neutrality of HA providers rather than on the lack of violence in an area or perceived strength of military forces. This difference in security paradigm may impact military planning, execution, and assessment. Planners at the operational level should ensure they are familiar with NGO operational policies and procedures that guide their efforts.

For more information on DOD guidance on working with humanitarian NGOs in hostile or potentially hostile environments, see the United States Institute of Peace's Guidelines for Relations Between US Armed Forces and Non-Governmental Humanitarian Organizations in Hostile or Potentially Hostile Environments.

f. **International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).** The ICRC is an independent and neutral organization ensuring humanitarian protection and assistance for victims of war and armed violence. The ICRC has a permanent mandate under international law to take impartial action for prisoners, the wounded and sick, and civilians affected by conflict. The Geneva Conventions give it a unique status.

g. **Multinational Corporations.** Multinational corporations often participate in reconstruction, economic development, and governance activities. When working with multinational corporations, the JFC should use existing mechanisms of the COM and country team, DOS, USAID, and other appropriate agencies. The joint force should provide support as required to the DOS economic counselor and the Foreign Commercial Service representative of the Department of Commerce (DOC) in the US mission to support IDAD. Even in the absence of other interagency partners on the ground, the JFC should use reachback through the GCC to consult with the appropriate agencies in Washington, DC, prior to coordination with multinational corporations. At a minimum, commanders should seek to know which companies are present in their area and where those companies are conducting business. Such information can prevent the destruction of private property, which in any case is subject to the regulation of international law.

h. **Government Contractors.** When contractors or other businesses are being paid to support US military or USG interagency partners involved in COIN, clear command and coordination relationships should be developed to provide for unity of command by the contracting agency and unity of effort with interagency partners.

i. **Private Security Contractors.** Armed contractors may provide different security services to the USG, HN, PNs, NGOs, and private businesses. Many businesses market expertise in areas related to supporting governance, economics, education, and other aspects of civil society as well. Providing capabilities similar to some NGOs, these firms often obtain contracts through government agencies. When under a USG contract, private security contractors behave as an extension of the organizations or agencies for which they work. Commanders should identify private security contractors operating in their area and determine the nature of their contract, existing accountability mechanisms, and appropriate coordination relationships. Depending on the terms of their contract, the environment in which they operate, and certain agreements the USG is a party to, private security

contractors may be subject to the laws of the HN and US law and are subject to international law. Any failure on the part of these participants could reflect negatively on counterinsurgent credibility and HN legitimacy, both nationally and internationally.

For additional information on the use of private security contractors, see Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 3020.50, Private Security Contractors (PSCs) Operating in Contingency Operations, Humanitarian or Peace Operations, or Other Military Operations or Exercises.

j. **Indigenous Populations and Institutions (IPI).** IPI is a generic term used to describe the civilian construct of an operational area, to include its populations (legal citizens, legal and illegal immigrants, and all categories of dislocated civilians) and governmental, tribal, commercial, and social organizations and entities. COIN seeks to legitimize the local governing body, whether that is an informal governing body or the HN's local government. The HN should be seen as a legitimate governing body the population supports. With this in mind, effective HN government collaboration with the IPI is a key requirement for successful COIN operations.

k. **Other.** Some organizations the joint force should coordinate with do not fit neatly into the previous categories or have the characteristics of more than one type of the previously mentioned categories. Additionally, many other groups can play critical roles in influencing the outcome of COIN, yet are beyond the control of military forces or civilian governing institutions. These groups can include local leaders, informal associations, religious groups, families, and the media. Commanders should remain aware of the influence of such groups and be prepared to interact with them.

7. Command and Organizational Relationships

a. Military unity of command leverages formal command or support relationships. Unity of command should extend to all military forces conducting COIN—US, HN, and other multinational forces—to achieve unity of effort that establishes effective control while attaining a monopoly on the legitimate use of force within the society.

b. Conducting the US interagency coordination required for COIN requires a departure from traditional military thinking. Conventional military C2 hierarchies are not appropriate for operational structures and environments where the military commander does not possess clear authority over all activities in the assigned operational area. As a result, coordination and collaboration are more applicable to achieving unity of effort.

c. While the JFC can exercise command authority over assigned and attached forces, actors outside of DOD will not reflect unity of command with one single authority and clearly defined roles and responsibilities. Effective COIN will require a deliberate effort to ensure inclusion, rather than exclusion, of all stakeholders. To achieve effective teaming, the JFC and staff should have a clear understanding of the different roles, authorities, missions, culture, objectives, and processes of external stakeholders. Due to the importance of information sharing and coordination among a diverse set of military and nonmilitary actors, a rigid hierarchical command structure may not be appropriate. At

various times, the JFC may draw on the capabilities of other USG departments and agencies, provide capabilities to other organizations, or merely deconflict joint force activities with those of others. The JFC may have some form of supported or supporting relationships with a wide range of civilian participants and organizations, but, in some cases, USG departments' and agencies' relationships with international organizations are voluntary and based upon shared goals and good will. The relationship between the JFC and the leadership of NGOs is neither supported nor supporting, but one of collaboration and coordination.

d. Political Considerations. As important as unity of command is to military operations, it is one of the most sensitive and difficult to resolve issues in COIN. Nations join multinational forces for various reasons. Although the missions of multinational partners may appear similar to those of the US, the ROE, home-country policies, and sensitivities may differ among partners. Military leaders should have a strong cultural and political awareness of US, HN, and other multinational military partners. The participation of US and multinational military forces in COIN missions is inherently problematic, as it influences perceptions of the capacity, credibility, and legitimacy of local security forces. Although unity of command of military forces may be desirable, it may be impractical due to political considerations. Political sensitivities about the perceived subordination of national forces to those of other states or international organizations often preclude strong command relationships; however, the agreements that establish a multinational force provide a source for determining possible authorities and command, or other relationships. US forces participating in a multinational operation will always have at least two distinct chains of command: a national chain of command and a multinational chain of command. As Commander-in-Chief, the President always retains, and cannot relinquish, national command authority over US forces. Command authority for a multinational force commander is normally negotiated between the participating nations and can vary from nation to nation.

e. National Mandates and Commitment. Nations choose the manner and extent of their foreign involvement for reasons both known and unknown to other nations. The only constant is that a decision to join in COIN is a calculated political decision by each potential member of a multinational force. The nature of their national interests, in turn, influences the overall command structure. In most multinational operations, the differing degrees of national interest result in varying levels of commitment by alliance and coalition members. While some countries might authorize the full range of employment, other countries may limit their country's forces to strictly defensive or combat service support roles, which may be specified in a list of national caveats.

f. Military Capabilities. Numerous factors influence the military capabilities of nations. The operational-level commander should be aware of the differences in the political constraints and capabilities of the forces of various nations and consider these differences when assigning missions and conducting operations. Commanders at all levels may be required to spend considerable time working political issues related to the utilization of multinational force troops; the requirement for diplomatic skills should not be underestimated. Army and Marine Corps civil affairs (CA) provide additional staff expertise for planning and executing CA operations in support of CMO. Commanders may

routinely work directly with political authorities in the region but should coordinate with the COM to ensure alignment with US foreign policy, to speak with one voice, and to avoid redundancy in key leader engagements. In the absence of a US diplomatic mission to the country, the commander should coordinate through the GCC to obtain guidance for any diplomacy. The basic challenge in multinational operations is the effective integration and synchronization of available assets toward the achievement of common objectives. This objective may be achieved through unity of effort despite disparate and occasionally incompatible capabilities, ROE, equipment, and procedures. To reduce disparities among participating forces, minimum capability standards should be established and a certification process developed.

g. **Command Structure.** No single command structure meets the needs of every multinational command, but one absolute remains constant. As in the creation of any multinational military structure, command relationships in COIN reflect political relationships among the partners and may change according to evolving political needs.

(1) **Lead Nation.** The best command structure in COIN is a lead nation structure wherein all member nations place their forces under one leader. The lead nation command is characterized by a dominant lead nation command and staff arrangement with subordinate elements retaining strict national integrity. Regardless of the starting command structure, this is the objective—the HN should ultimately take the lead for COIN to be successful.

(2) **Integrated.** Multinational commands organized under an integrated command structure provide unity of effort in a multinational setting. This command structure often has a strategic commander designated from a member nation, but the strategic command staff and the commanders and staffs of subordinate commands are of multinational makeup. This is the second-best command structure in COIN. The structure is most effective when the HN is viable and has effective political and military establishments.

(3) **Parallel.** Under a parallel command structure, no single force commander is designated. The multinational force leadership should develop a means for coordination among the participants to achieve unity of effort. This can be accomplished through the use of coordination centers. Nonetheless, because of the absence of a single commander, the use of a parallel command structure should be avoided if at all possible. This may often be the initial condition for supporting an HN's COIN, although it is the least favored.

For additional detail, refer to JP 3-16, Multinational Operations.

h. Coordination and information sharing between the joint force, other interagency partners, international organizations, and NGOs should not be equated to the C2 of a military operation. Successful interorganizational coordination helps enable the USG to build international support, conserve resources, and conduct coherent operations that efficiently achieve shared objectives. All friendly and neutral actors should seek to coordinate, or at least deconflict, their activities with the activities of other organizations.

For further discussion about the appropriate protocols for communicating and working in the same OE, see The Guidelines for Relations Between US Armed Forces and Nongovernmental Humanitarian Organizations.

i. In large footprint COIN operations, the physical collocation of civil-military teams is desirable but is not essential to achieve effective civil-military teaming. Experience suggests that civilian government organizations, from both the US and potential PN, may not be resourced deeply enough to provide dedicated manning to all counterpart military staffs on a continual basis. In cases where physical collocation is either not feasible or desirable, the JFC should consider options for virtual teaming or situational teaming to accomplish specific planning or operational activities.

j. Importantly, the level of authority for the JFC is limited. Civilian representation to the joint force may be dedicated or part-time. Only a liaison officer, with no decision-making authority, will represent some organizations. Others may possess full authority to make commitments for their organizations. Experience indicates many civilian organizations and many NGOs will not enter a military headquarters. They will be very cautious about potential perceptions regarding their association with the military. This will require the development of a reliable and accessible means of communication between the JFC, his staff, and the interorganizational partners.

k. The JFC should collaborate with the COM to establish a process between the military and civilian interagency partners when there is a disagreement regarding execution of specific operations. Interagency partners are obligated to raise issues up their individual lines of authority (chains of command) when they cannot be resolved at lower levels.

8. Employment Considerations

a. **Mission Command.** As joint land operations tend to become decentralized, mission command becomes the preferred method of C2. Successful mission command demands that subordinate leaders at all echelons exercise disciplined initiative, acting aggressively and independently to accomplish the mission. Essential to mission command is the thorough knowledge and understanding of the commander's intent at every level of command. Under mission command, commanders issue mission type orders, use implicit communications, and delegate most decisions to subordinates wherever possible. Mission command is especially suited to distributed operations by land forces in a COIN operation.

(1) **Decentralized Execution.** COIN requires empowering the lowest levels for decentralized execution (and in some cases decentralized planning) based upon mission command, centralized planning, and direction. The nature of COIN is ideally suited to decentralized execution. On-scene commanders often have the best grasp of the situation within the OE. The JFC should be able to respond to all forms of insurgent operations, often simultaneously; thus, subordinate commanders should have control of the resources needed to produce timely intelligence, conduct effective tactical operations, and manage the CCS process. The operational approach should be tailored to the local conditions. This is not just applicable between the operational and tactical levels, but within the tactical level. Distributed operations require decentralized execution in conjunction with the

intelligence-operations fusion at the lowest possible level. The joint force should position joint bases and combat outposts as close as feasible to the population that it is seeking to secure, relying on local intelligence and security assessments. Commanders should provide subordinates with a mission, commander's intent, CONOPS, and resources adequate to accomplish the mission. They leave details of execution to their subordinates and expect them to use initiative and judgment to accomplish the mission. Successful, decentralized execution results from exercise by subordinate leaders, at all echelons, of disciplined initiative within the commander's intent to accomplish missions. It requires an environment of trust and mutual understanding and is the preferred method for commanding and controlling COIN forces.

(2) **Distributed Operations.** COIN operations often require units, sometimes widely distributed and beyond mutually supporting range of each other, to conduct nonlinear activities/operations often in small noncontiguous operational areas within the joint operations area. These distributed operations allow US and HN actors to respond to all forms of insurgent activities, often simultaneously, and across a large area.

Refer to Chapter VII, "Counterinsurgency Operations," for additional discussion regarding distributed operations.

(3) **Distribute Resources Across Echelons.** Commanders are often faced with combat situations where they may have little experience or resources and little time to prepare. In such cases, additional assets/capabilities may be assigned or attached to a unit to allow it to perform its mission more effectively. Whether a commander has several months or only a few days to plan, prepare for, and train/rehearse for a mission, shortfalls in required assets/capabilities may become evident that require a commander and staff to seek additional assistance from outside sources. A commander may find that a changing phase of an operation requires additional or different skill sets to accomplish the mission. In these instances, higher headquarters should be prepared, proactive, and expeditious in augmenting their subordinates with the expertise they require to enable effective COIN operations. Key enablers that consist of low-density personnel and equipment should be adequately identified and planned for across the joint force. A thorough analysis of the COIN operation should allocate resources such as intelligence, counterintelligence, aviation, route clearance, logistics, interpreters, translators, cultural advisors, and ordnance, among others, to allow for the requisite skill or equipment to support the joint force LOE at the correct echelon. Recent COIN experiences have shown, particularly in functions such as intelligence, that higher echelons may have to push or redistribute essential analysts to a lower level where they can be employed most effectively.

b. **Task-Organizing for COIN**

(1) **Integration of Capabilities.** Units operating at the local level need the right mix of low-density enablers, such as military working dogs and their handlers, CA and military information support specialists, and the integration of any participating civilian organizations. JFCs may request specific enablers from the Services. Services, in accordance with Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction (CJCSI) 3210.06, *Irregular Warfare*, are required to measure and assess density and experience in IW and

relevant SFA and CTF skills by tracking military and civilian personnel with skills and experience relevant to IW. Many of these skill sets are directly relevant to COIN.

(2) **Intelligence Assets.** Intelligence collection and analysis assets need to be pushed to the lowest levels to enable rapid analysis of the OE. Units need to adopt a decision cycle that is faster than insurgent's operational cycle.

c. Predeployment Training Requirements

(1) **COIN Environment.** During COIN operations, tasks will often need to be carried out in ways generally requiring specialized training and sometimes requiring development of new TTP. The targeted application of capabilities in a conflict situation is fraught with the risk of unintended consequences and requires a sophisticated understanding of the local situation. COIN often involves a wider range of tasks and capabilities than are required in traditional warfare. CJCSI 3210.06, *Irregular Warfare*, directs the Services to track "irregular warfare-relevant skills" at the individual level. The tracking of IW-relevant skills can assist with predeployment training planning prior to a COIN operation.

(2) **Sociocultural and Political-Military Context.** To implement a COIN strategy successfully, US forces and the DOD civilians that support them should be prepared for the operational, geographic, and sociocultural complexities of the OE. A force's training, personnel processes, and programs should be aligned to provide deploying units, leaders, and staffs with language, cultural, tactical, interagency, and advisory skills required to conduct COIN operations successfully in support of an HN government. The deploying force should understand military operations and TTP support the political strategy.

(3) **Leadership and Ethics.** One of the most difficult aspects of preparing for COIN operations is the need to prepare Service members and units to take aggressive action against the enemy while also training them to identify noncombatants from combatants and to avoid abusive behavior and use of excessive force during extremely stressful combat situations. Training should prepare Service members and units for their legal obligations, as well as the debilitating effects of fear and combat stress. Ensuring legal conduct during COIN operations is particularly difficult because OE is often characterized by violence, lawlessness, distrust, and deceit. Preserving innocent lives and maintaining human dignity are central to COIN mission accomplishment. COIN operations often present complex emotional and ethical dilemmas. Service members should remain faithful to basic American and military standards of behavior and respect for the sanctity of life.

9. Conventional Forces Considerations

a. Conventional ground forces bring capabilities that play an important role in the military contribution to COIN operations. These forces and capabilities are especially critical for successful counterinsurgency, counterintelligence, intelligence, humanitarian, and informational efforts. Aviation contributions include close air support (CAS); precision strikes; armed overwatch; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR); personnel

recovery (PR); and air mobility. Air mobility aviation forces and capabilities provide considerable advantages to counterinsurgents, especially by denying insurgents secrecy and uncontested access to bases of operation. Conventional aviation enables counterinsurgents to operate in rough and remote terrain, areas that insurgents traditionally have used as safe havens. Ground and aviation forces can also provide precision fires on targets as an all-weather day or night capability. If insurgents assemble a conventional force or their operating locations are identified and isolated, aviation and ground surface-to-surface assets can respond quickly with precision fires or to airlift ground forces to locations to accomplish a mission.

b. Ground forces surface-to-surface fire support elements can also provide for precision fires. These capabilities may be utilized independently or may compliment and be delivered in concert with ground forces' direct fires and aviation delivered fires. These capabilities are also scalable and of various ranges. Naval surface fire support can also provide effective fires in littoral areas, although it may be range limited if operations are occurring farther inland. Use of these capabilities, just like use of precision strikes from aircraft, requires precise targeting and quality, continuous, and combat information and intelligence to ensure not only the target is struck, but friendly fire and collateral damage are considered. Staffs should plan for and conduct drills for the employment of all precision fires and ensure fire support elements are fully integrated.

c. Conventional maritime forces, in addition to providing fires and sea-based aviation in support of ground operations, can also conduct maritime security operations (MSO) and riverine operations to deny the insurgents freedom of maneuver and disrupt insurgent logistics. Depending on the geography, riverine operations may take on a vital role by creating access to geographically isolated areas that would otherwise be uncontested insurgent safe havens.

10. Special Operations Considerations

a. **Special Operations Forces (SOF) and COIN Approaches.** SOF may conduct a wide array of missions with HNSF or may be integrated with US conventional forces. They are particularly important when the joint force is using an indirect approach to COIN. In a more balanced or direct approach to COIN, however, they should be used to complement rather than replace conventional forces in traditional warfare roles.

b. **SOF Core Activities and COIN.** SOF are specifically organized, trained, and equipped to accomplish the following special operations core activities: COIN, direct action (DA), special reconnaissance (SR), unconventional warfare (UW), FID, SFA, CT, CA operations, MISO, hostage rescue/recovery, FHA, and countering weapons of mass destruction (CWMD). With the exception of UW, any of these SOF core activities may be involved in COIN in the HN. In certain situations, aspects of UW may be required to influence the external source contributing to COIN operations. SOF should adhere to the same principles of COIN as conventional forces. Even if focused on DA missions, SOF should be cognizant of the need to win and maintain popular support.

(1) **DA.** DA missions may be required in COIN to capture or kill key insurgent leaders or other vital insurgent targets or recover valuable information or material. The specific types of DA are raids, ambushes, and direct assaults; standoff attacks; terminal attack control and terminal guidance operations; PR operations; precision strike operations; and anti-surface operations.

(2) **SR.** SOF may conduct SR into insurgent strongholds or sanctuaries. Activities within SR include environmental reconnaissance, armed reconnaissance, target and threat assessment, and post-strike reconnaissance.

(3) **CWMD.** If weapons of mass destruction (WMD) become available, insurgents may attempt to integrate them into their arsenal for physical destruction and, more important, psychological and political impact. Insurgents may employ WMD against soft targets in acts of terrorism or against conventional government military forces or use the threat of WMD attack as leverage in negotiations. Insurgent concepts of employment for WMD may include conventional and clandestine delivery of chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear weapons for the purposes of disruption, destabilization, coercion, or revenge.

For additional information, see JP 3-26, Counterterrorism; JP 3-05, Special Operations; JP 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense; and JP 3-40, Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction.

c. **Army Special Operations Forces (ARSOF) Capabilities.** ARSOF units (special forces, ranger, military information support teams, CA, and aviation) can support COIN operations conducted by HN forces, or conducting combat and other operations as required.

d. **Marine Corps Special Operations Forces (MARSOF) Capabilities.** MARSOF can support COIN operations conducted by HN forces or conduct SR, DA, FID, or other special operations core activities as required.

e. **Navy Special Operations Forces (NAVSOF) Capabilities.** NAVSOF can support COIN operations by providing naval special warfare forces and special boat teams to train HN forces or conduct SR, DA, and other operations as required.

f. **Air Force Special Operations Forces (AFSOF) Capabilities.** AFSOF can support COIN operations by working with HN aviation forces. AFSOF maintain specially trained combat aviation advisors to assess, train, advise, assist, and equip HN aviation capability. AFSOF special tactics teams enhance the air-to-ground interface, synchronizing conventional and special operations during COIN operations. Additionally, AFSOF possess certain core mission capabilities such as mobility, strike, and ISR, which can enhance operations.

For additional information on SOF capabilities, refer to JP 3-05, Special Operations.

11. Force Protection Considerations

Force protection is a constant requirement, and priority, in every operation and should be included in the planning process. The level of force protection required for the mission

may change throughout the course of the operation or may be different within the area of operation. As a result, commanders should decentralize force protection levels to the lowest echelon based on the threat. The JFC should also ensure coordination with the HN is conducted to ensure adequate protection measures are utilized to protect both US and HN assets and the populace as a whole. Leaders should avoid making tactically unsound decisions or exposing the force to unnecessary risks while attempting to limit the level and scope of violence used in stability tasks. Rigid force protection measures may alienate the COIN force from the population. By traveling in armored vehicles and wearing an assortment of personal force protection items, the public can get the impression US forces are afraid or an area is not secure. Force protection should be balanced with the need to mitigate this perception and demonstrate that the population is as safe as US forces. Additionally, sequestration of the force from the population may reduce exposure to attack, but inevitably causes the force to become disconnected from the population and reduces its understanding of the environment. Ideally, force protection measures will be planned in such a way as to align them with the imperative to secure the population.

12. Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration

Disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR) is the process of standing down parties to an armed conflict and the reintegration of ex-combatants into civilian life. It seeks to address the post-conflict security challenge that arises from ex-combatants being left without livelihoods or support networks during such critical transition periods. DDR attempts to stabilize the OE by disarming and demobilizing insurgents during the insurgency and by helping return former insurgents to civilian life. The UN and other international organizations generally view DDR efforts as post-conflict activities. Historically, however, DDR programs are not only possible but also desirable from the earliest stages of a COIN operation or campaign, but they should be carefully tailored to the local context. A successful DDR program helps ensure former insurgents are successfully integrated back into society and do not return to the insurgent forces. DDR closely coordinates with reform efforts in all sectors, and DDR planning directly ties to SSR, determining the potential size and scope of military, police, and other security structures. The success of DDR depends on integrating strategies and planning across all related sectors. Females who have been associated with guerilla forces need specialized assistance during the DDR process. Females who have been raped or physically abused need counseling and medical services. Many women find, after being a guerilla, their former communities shun them for having rejected more traditional female roles. Conversely, demobilized females can be highly valuable human intelligence (HUMINT) sources, given their knowledge of their former unit and their various experiences. As an example, the Colombian Ministry of National Defense's demobilization program identified females who had been insurgents for 10 years or more as the most valuable demobilized individuals and offered the highest monetary incentive to those who could bring in such an individual.

a. **Purpose.** DDR is a complex process, with political, military, security, humanitarian, and socioeconomic dimensions. In a post-conflict environment, when former combatants are left without livelihoods or support networks, other than their former comrades, it seeks to maximize the effects of the process for individuals, units, or groups

of actors during the vital transition period from conflict to peace. DDR of females requires special considerations for medical treatment and counseling due to the high frequency of sexual assault and rape. DDR of children associated with the fighting forces should be conducted separately from adult DDR processes; children should be treated as victims of human rights violations and afforded additional protection throughout the process.

b. **Disarmament.** Disarmament is the collection, documentation, control, and disposal of arms, ammunition, and explosives of former insurgents and the population. Disarmament also includes the development of responsible arms management programs based upon a HN agreement regarding ownership of personal weapons. Ideally, disarmament is a voluntary process applied to and accepted by former insurgents or enacted as part of the peace process. Disarmament functions best when high levels of trust exist between those being disarmed and the forces overseeing disarmament. Some groups may hesitate to offer trust and cooperation or might even refuse to participate in disarmament efforts. In these circumstances, disarmament may occur in two stages: a voluntary disarmament process followed by a second phase employing more coercive measures. The latter will address individuals or small groups refusing to participate voluntarily. In this second stage, disarmament of combatant factions can become a contentious and potentially very destabilizing step of DDR. Disarmament may be a slow process in an ongoing COIN. The HN and multinational partners manage DDR carefully to avoid disarmament becoming a catalyst for renewed violence.

c. **Demobilization.** Demobilization is the process of transitioning insurgents from a state of conflict to a peacetime configuration, while simultaneously maintaining national security and economic vitality. Demobilization for COIN normally involves the controlled discharge of combatants from insurgent forces that have stopped fighting. Demobilization under these circumstances includes identifying, notifying, and gathering former combatants for demobilization efforts. Demobilization involves deliberately dismantling insurgent organizations and belligerent groups, refocusing their loyalties to more appropriate group affiliations, and restoring the identity of former fighters to that of one who is part of the national population.

d. **Reintegration.** Reintegration is the process through which former insurgents are brought back into peaceful civil society. During this process, former insurgents enter a program from taking up arms against the government to receive education, training in needed civilian skills, and strategies that help them become socially and economically embedded in a community. It's important to track former insurgents as they reenter civil society, to ensure they succeed. If they don't succeed in reintegration, they may return to the insurgent ranks and deal a severe blow to the government for not upholding its promises to insurgents who enter the DDR process. As many of the insurgents may have been living in harsh rural terrain for many if not all of their years, steps will have to be taken to integrate former insurgents into new local communities, villages, and social groups. Issues such as family reunification, psychological counseling, and health support should be planned for. It accounts for the specific needs of women and children associated with insurgent and other armed groups. Insurgents will be under extraordinary pressure from their former fighting colleagues. This pressure to return to the insurgent ranks can come in the form of intimidation, death threats and letters, physical abuse, assassinations, or serious injury if

the reintegrated fighter does not return to the fighting ranks of the insurgents. It is vital that COIN forces provide physical security for the reintegrated fighter; protection for him/her and their families will be paramount to ensure a lasting reintegration process and an atmosphere of trust between the government and the reintegrated fighter. The reintegration process should account for individuals who may have committed crimes against humanity. If individuals are sentenced and held in detention, reintegration programs can be set up in the place of detention.

For additional information, refer to Chapter V, “Planning.”

13. Economic and Infrastructure Development

a. Economic and infrastructure development have been frequently featured as a key LOE in recent COIN operations. Often, such efforts have featured Western templates to determine priorities and have struggled to secure the local population’s buy-in. Economic and infrastructure development in support of COIN should be based on local expectations, capabilities, and capacities to ensure sustainability. Fulfilling local expectations in terms of service delivery can help bolster the legitimacy of HN governance structures, while undermining the insurgency. By contrast, efforts that do not take local conditions and expectations as their starting point run the risk of disrupting or undermining benign local governance structures, strengthening the insurgency, fostering corruption, and creating dependencies. Counterinsurgents should avoid relying on infrastructure outputs as metrics in themselves. For example, in Afghanistan, many resources went to building local schools. Many of those schools sat empty as the community did not want or need them. Also, many of the schools did not come with funds for teachers, books, and other school supplies, making them nonoperational or useable after construction was complete. Instead, metrics should capture how economic and infrastructure development affect political and social attitudes. In a COIN context, such efforts aim at undercutting the insurgency narrative and addressing core grievances. They are not synonymous with long-term development efforts that may be carried out by other USG departments and agencies, international organizations, and NGOs. However, counterinsurgents should aim to ensure short-term stabilization measures do not undercut long-term development goals.

b. **Service Delivery.** Decisions on supporting service delivery should be based on local expectations. The social contract in the HN determines what the population expects of different governance structures in terms of service delivery. This may or may not include water and sanitation, electricity, communication and transportation infrastructure, medical care, and education. Careful analysis of local conditions is required to determine which services should be supported by USG or joint force efforts to achieve the COIN objective. Priority LOEs should be developed in close cooperation with HN governance structures. Popular expectations, as well as the capacity of HN governance structures to absorb support, will determine what can be realistically achieved. To the extent possible, actual service delivery should be carried out—and seen to be carried out—by HN structures.

Intentionally Blank

CHAPTER IV THE OPERATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

“The first lesson of counterinsurgency, in fact, is that every situation is truly unique, has its own context, its own specific set of factors – and you have to understand that context in enormous detail to be able to craft a sound and comprehensive approach.”

**General David H. Petraeus,
United States Army Commanding General, Multinational Force - Iraq
“The Longest Campaign of the Long War,” Der Spiegel, September 2008.**

1. Introduction

a. **Understanding the OE.** An understanding of the OE enables the development of a COIN approach that includes realistic, achievable objectives and properly aligns ends, ways, and means. Understanding of the OE is accomplished through tailoring JIPOE and assessment requirements for COIN. Through enhanced understanding of the OE, the JFC can improve the ability to:

- (1) Decipher the true nature of the problem the joint operation is meant to resolve.
- (2) Develop realistic military end states and objectives that deliver decisive results to the civilian leadership.
- (3) Develop an operational approach that is relevant to the nature of the conflict, appropriate for the operational area, and feasible based on available resources.
- (4) Consider relevant aspects of the OE during the planning and execution of activities and operations that require fires.

b. The OE is the composite of the conditions, circumstances, and influences that affects the JFC’s employment of capabilities and bear on the decisions of the commander. It encompasses physical areas and factors (of the air, land, maritime, and space domains), the electromagnetic spectrum (EMS), and the information environment (which includes cyberspace). Included within these are enemy, friendly, and neutral systems that are relevant to a specific joint operation. The nature and interaction of these systems will affect how the commander plans, organizes for, and conducts joint operations. Within COIN, understanding the OE requires a holistic view of PMESII systems. The decision making of relevant actors and the public opinion of the local population are major considerations in a COIN operation. Thus, understanding the OE requires an understanding of the factors that shape the decision-making and associated behavior of relevant actors. A holistic understanding of all relevant components within the OE helps the JFC to understand how the OE can be shaped; how the OE affects capabilities; and how friendly, threat, and neutral actors’ actions affect or shape the conflict. Of greatest significance, understanding relevant aspects of the OE enables the JFC to leverage aspects of the OE to achieve COIN objectives.

c. Understanding the OE in COIN informs planning, execution, and assessment of various aspects of the operation.

(1) **Planning.** During mission analysis, a shared understanding of the OE from a holistic COIN perspective is essential. It helps identify the true nature of the problem, including root causes of the insurgency, the mission, and the effects that should be created within the OE to achieve the desired objectives and reach an acceptable political end state of the COIN operation. Understanding the OE enables the planning and execution of missions and activities that make sense for the nature of the conflict and that are appropriate in the context of the JFC's operational approach. It also enables improved planning by better understanding the potential second- and third-order effects.

(2) **Execution.** Components and units tasked for missions and activities refine their understanding of specific areas and other aspects of the OE. Mission planning, with the enhanced understanding of relevant factors within a designated operational area through intelligence preparation of the battlespace (IPB), enables operators to better execute their missions. Much of the information to support COIN operations is gathered at the tactical level and involves tasking operators to support collection of certain information. The addition of fusion cells at the tactical level enhances mission effectiveness. Operational-level planners also have the ability to pull from an assortment of theater- and national-level resources to provide operators the information they need for execution.

(3) **Assessment.** Operation assessment in COIN links the effects to be created through the COAs with the actual effects created. It helps answer the question: Are the correct tasks and activities being done to achieve the established objectives of the operation, and are those tasks and activities being done correctly? By developing a clear understanding of the current state of these relevant factors, a determination can be made about progress (or lack thereof) toward achieving the desired objectives of the COIN operation. Planning the operation assessment should start with operational planning and continue with assessment throughout execution. The joint process for assessment is detailed in JP 3-0, *Joint Operations*, and is also explained in JP 5-0, *Joint Planning*.

Refer to Chapter VI, "Assessment," regarding assessment in COIN operations.

2. Operational Environment in Counterinsurgency

a. **Components.** The various aspects of the OE provide a lens through which a COIN force may gain an understanding of the decision-making and associated behavior of the relevant actors. The COIN OE encompasses the relevant actors and the physical areas and sociocultural and other factors throughout the entire OE.

b. **Relevant Actors.** The most important aspect of the OE is the relevant actors. These include the population, the COIN force, the HN government, and the insurgents. Other relevant actors may include state actors supporting the insurgency and non-state actors that may be part of the insurgency (e.g., transnational terrorist or criminal organizations) and/or the NGO community. By first understanding who the relevant actors

are and learning as much as possible about them, the JFC develops an approach that may influence the actors' decision making and behavior (active or passive) in a way that is consistent with the objectives of the operation. In a COIN environment, individuals may fit into more than one category of actor (e.g., a tribal leader may also work as a district governor, while also working behind the scenes to provide financial and material support to the insurgency).

c. **Physical Factors.** In COIN operations, the physical factors of the operational area typically and predominantly concern the land domain. It includes the terrain (including urban settings such as megacities and subterranean structures), infrastructure (including the location of bases and ports), topography, hydrology, and environmental conditions in the operational area, as well as the distances associated with deployment to the operational area and the employment of forces and other joint capabilities. Collectively, many of these factors influence the operational design and sustainment of joint operations. In COIN, the important aspects of the physical factors are those that either provide insight into, or impact, the decisions and behavior of the various relevant actors within the operational area. Appreciation of these aspects of the OE facilitates planning and execution of the COIN operation.

d. **Information Environment.** The information environment refers to the aggregate of individuals, organizations, and systems that collect, process, disseminate, or act on information. It includes many different physical and nonphysical aspects of the OE. Depending on the specific OE, relevant aspects of the information environment may include media outlets such as radio and television, Internet communications such as e-mail and social networking sites, cellular telephone and radio communication, and channels of information flow via word of mouth. The information environment also includes the infrastructure and technology that supports the various types of communication. Insurgents and transnational terrorists may have mastered (or have a significant advantage through a shared cultural understanding) the use of the information environment, especially social media, for planning, C2, influencing public opinion, and recruiting members. Understanding relevant aspects of the information environment enhances the JFC's ability to predict, respond to, and/or influence the behavior of actors within the OE.

For more detail on the holistic view of the OE, see JP 2-01.3, Joint Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment.

3. Tools and Methods for Understanding the Operational Environment

Many tools and methodologies have been developed that are worthy of consideration by the JFC for understanding the OE for a COIN operation.

a. **Traditional Intelligence Approaches.** Tailoring traditional intelligence methodologies to a focus on relevant actors improves prediction of their decision-making and associated behavior and informs appropriate COAs. All of the intelligence disciplines are relevant to understanding the OE in COIN.

b. **ISR.** Intelligence collection assets, especially unmanned aircraft systems, have emerged as reliable and highly beneficial to a more holistic understanding of the OE. Imagery can be used to show the frequented locations of various actors in operational areas, while other intelligence assets have enabled the JFC to develop a more robust understanding of broader opportunity, motive, and means of insurgents, in addition to fulfilling more traditional roles of monitoring adversary military capabilities, often in real time. Intelligence collection assets are also essential to support security and fires; therefore, land forces may have to compete for scarce intelligence resources and utilize intelligence assets in nontraditional ways to support COIN. The suitability of land forces using the full-range of unmanned aircraft systems and the environment in highly populated urban areas should be evaluated as early as possible during planning. Evaluate the level and quality of digital terrain elevation data required for the operational area, including a request for enhanced data if required.

For more detailed information regarding use of ISR, refer to Army Techniques Publication (ATP) 3-55.3/Marine Corps Reference Publication (MCRP) 2-10A.8/Navy Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (NTTP) 2-01.3/Air Force Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures (AFTTP) 3-2.88, Multi-Service Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Optimization.

c. **Sociocultural Analysis.** Sociocultural analysis is the analysis of adversaries and other relevant actors that integrates concepts, knowledge, and understanding of societies, populations, and other groups, including their activities, relationships, and perspectives, across time and space at varying scales. In the JIPOE process, sociocultural analysis is an application of methodologies to help discern drivers of behavior for groups and individuals. An enhanced ability to analyze the sociocultural factors provides the potential to predict, respond to, and/or influence decision-making and associated behavior by the relevant actors. Several subsets of sociocultural analysis relevant to COIN that have been used in the past include:

(1) **Mapping of the Sociocultural Factors.** Sociocultural mapping integrates georeferenced social, cultural, political, economic, and infrastructure data and elements of the information environment into all-source analysis concerning the operational area. The JFC may realize significant sociocultural differences among groups/individuals associated with an insurgency in the operational area.

(2) **Human Geography.** Geography is the study of places and the relationships between people and their environments. Human geography focuses on the relationships between people and places, emphasizing spatial-temporal patterns of people, particularly their traits and activities, in the context of their geographic environment.

(3) **Sociocultural Dynamics Analysis.** This is the analysis of the social, cultural, and behavioral, factors that characterize the relationships of the population and individuals of interest in a specific region or operational area. It includes population support and stability, population and environmental characteristics, populations supporting active insurgencies, human factors, cultural factors within foreign military and security forces, foreign media analyses, and population support to covert military operations.

(4) **Human Factors Analysis.** This involves the psychological, cultural, behavioral, and other human attributes that influence decision making and information interpretation by individuals or groups at any level in any state or organization.

d. **Analytical frameworks** can be useful in understanding the OE in COIN because they encourage a more holistic analysis. However, considering the various focus areas within the analytical frameworks alone does not guarantee an operationally relevant understanding of the OE. Although frameworks can be valuable for basic regional and cultural assessments, they are not sufficient for navigating the more unpredictable events that may occur when boundaries between framework categorization schemes are blurred by unanticipated intercultural interactions. Preparation for these exigencies requires personnel with higher levels of language, regional expertise, and culture proficiency.

(1) Joint doctrine provides many analytical frameworks for analyzing the OE. The following analytical frameworks (see Figure IV-1) point toward a very broad set of considerations the JFC makes in all operations:

(a) Mission, enemy, terrain and weather, troops and support available-time available, and, appropriate, civilian considerations.

(b) Areas, structures, capabilities, organizations, people, and events (ASCOPE).

(c) PMESII.

(2) On a cautionary note, the JFC can produce endless streams of information under each category of a framework, but operational relevance is the key to making each of these analytic processes useful. This is done through analyzing the components of the frameworks and assessing whether they support the COIN operation or campaign and whether they inform the decision-making and associated behavior of the relevant actors within the OE.

For more information on a holistic view of the OE, see JP 2-01.3, Joint Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment.

e. **Social Network Analysis**

(1) Social network analysis is a useful tool to determine the various connections, nodes, and influences on particular organizations and individuals. When employing social network analysis to understand the overall OE and identify COGs and critical capability (CC)/critical requirement (CR)/critical vulnerability (CV) factors, commanders and planners take care to ensure this process remains relevant at the operational level, resisting the temptation to break the overall OE picture into small, discrete systems and individuals. The latter may be appropriate at the tactical/targeting level, but when attempting to understand the OE and its players, commanders strive for the larger, more holistic picture. Commanders and planners are mindful that COIN is both a population and threat-focused effort. As such, their understanding of the OE includes the influences on, and behavior of, all relevant actors, not just the behavior of the threat.

Potential Analytical Frameworks

	P Political	M Military	E Economic	S Social	I Information	I Infrastructure
A Areas	District boundary, provincial boundary, party affiliation areas	MNF, HNSF bases, historical ambush/IED sites	Bazaar areas, farming areas, livestock dealers, repair shops	Traditional picnic areas, bazaars, outdoor meeting sites	Radio/TV/paper coverage areas, graffiti, posters, word of mouth gathering points	Irrigation networks, water tables, areas with medical services
S Structures	Provincial/district centers, meeting halls, polling sites	Provincial/district police HQ, insurgent leaders houses/businesses	Bazaars, grain storage, businesses, banks	Religious sites, worship centers, popular gathering sites, restaurants	Cellular, radio, TV towers, print shops, newspapers	Roads, bridges, rail lines, gas lines, electrical lines, dams
C Capabilities	Dispute resolution, local leadership, judges, insurgent ability to affect	HNSF providing 24/7 security/ QRF present/ insurgent strength/ weapons recruiting	Access to banks, ability to withstand drought, development, black market	Strength of tribal, family, or village traditional structures, religious leaders, justice means	Literacy rates, availability of electronic media, phone service	Ability to build or maintain roads/bridges/ dams/irrigation systems
O Organizations	Political parties, insurgent networks affiliations, government, international organization, and NGO	Multinational and HNSF presence, insurgent network(s) presence	Banks, large landholders, cooperatives, economic development NGO	Tribes, clans, families, sports groups, youth groups or organizations	News organizations, influential religious centers, insurgent IO groups	Government ministries, construction companies
P People	Mayors, governors, councils, elders, judges, religious leaders	Multinational, HNSF, insurgent military leaders	Bankers, landholders, merchants, money lenders, criminals	Religious/civic leaders, elders, council members, influential families	Media owners, religious/civic leaders, elders, heads of families, merchants	Builders, engineers, contractors, local development councils
E Events	Elections, campaigns, council meetings, speeches, trials	Tactical engagements, loss of leadership, operations, unit RIP	Drought, harvest, business openings, loss of business, good/ bad harvests	Worship days, religious/civic holidays, weddings, funerals, births, market days	Worship days, political campaigns, project openings, festivals, civilian casualty incidents	Road/bridge construction, well digging, civic center/school construction

Legend

HNSF	host-nation security forces	NGO	nongovernmental organization
HQ	headquarters	QRF	quick reaction force
IED	improvised explosive device	RIP	relief in place
IO	information operations	TV	television
MNF	multinational force		

Figure IV-1. Potential Analytical Frameworks

(2) No individual or organization is simply part of one network, and very few are either entirely supportive of US objectives or entirely hostile. Commanders make more-informed decisions on COAs based on an understanding of linkages to the insurgent network and the population, as well as the social, political, and economic linkages outside of the insurgent network. When evaluating the OE using a social network analysis tool, commanders and planners consider the friendly, neutral, and threat networks; internal and

external actors; the HN government; and the internal and external influences on these entities. There is a danger in isolating one part of the OE from the others in that it may produce an oversimplified picture of the OE, leading to operational decisions that have deleterious second- and third-order effects.

For additional information regarding social network analysis, refer to JP 3-25, Countering Threat Networks.

f. **Social Science.** Social science is the study of people in society and how they relate to one another and to the group to which they belong. Therefore, social science disciplines offer specialized capabilities to gather, analyze, and provide data for a better understanding of the OE through an actor-centric approach. Social sciences include anthropology, archaeology, criminology, economics, education, history, linguistics, communication studies, political science, international relations, sociology, human geography, psychology, and gender.

g. **Information Management and Information Technology.** Various classified and unclassified systems, databases, and software packages assist with providing an enhanced understanding of the OE in COIN. However, barriers to classification, connectivity challenges, and a lack of understanding of the multitude of available systems can lead to stove-piping and/or loss of information. Each CCMD has implemented a mission partner information system for information exchange between mission partners. In a COIN operation, the JFC constructs an information management architecture that attempts to utilize the geographic CCMD's enduring or standing information exchange structure or system that makes sense for the operation, while also accounting for the factors of each entity's structures that cannot be changed. US Cyber Command and Service components can assist with the identification of portions of the DOD information networks that need to be protected from malicious cyberspace activity by insurgent or proxy forces. In a multinational operation, there are competing requirements to meet the needs of information management and information sharing for the chain of command of each entity. Thus, the JFC makes information management a planning factor as early as possible in the operation so as to minimize obstacles to information sharing and storage caused by poorly developed infrastructures in the field.

h. **Identity Activities.** The ability to accurately identify or verify an individual is a critical component in COIN operations. In traditional conflicts, the identity of individual combatants typically did not matter, as their uniforms easily identified them as the enemy. However, in COIN conflicts where combatants, noncombatants, insurgents, and civilians may dress the same and live and work together, the positive identification of individual combatants assumes much greater importance. Identity activities are a collection of functions and actions that appropriately recognize and differentiate one entity from another to support decision making. They include the collection of identity attributes and physical materials; their processing and exploitation; support to all-source analytic efforts; production of identity intelligence (I2) and DOD law enforcement criminal intelligence products; and dissemination of those products to inform policy and strategy development, operational planning and assessment, and appropriate action at the point of encounter. These functions and actions are conducted by maneuver, intelligence, and law enforcement

components. I2 is not an intelligence process but an intelligence product that results from the fusion of specific identifying attributes (biological, biographical, behavioral, and reputational information related to an individual) and other information and intelligence associated with those attributes collected across all intelligence disciplines. Identity activities utilizes enabling activities, like biometrics, forensics, and document and media exploitation (DOMEX), to discover the existence of unknown potential threat actors by connecting individuals to other persons, places, events, or materials; analyzing patterns of life; and characterizing their level of potential threats to US interests.

(1) **Biometrics.** Biometrics is an enabling technology that cross-cuts many activities and operations and is a key enabler of identity activities. Biometrics enhances force protection and targeting by helping to positively identify persons of interest, insurgents, terrorists, criminals, and others who would do harm to US and friendly forces and facilities. Regardless of disguises, aliases, or falsified documents, an individual's biometrics will positively identify the person. Intelligence-related functions biometrics can support or enhance include counterintelligence, intelligence analysis, interrogation and detention tasks, high-value target confirmation, and source vetting. Other COIN-related missions biometrics can support include:

- (a) Raids and cordon operations.
- (b) Base access, checkpoints, and protection of critical sites.
- (c) Area security operations.
- (d) Border control and ports of entry.
- (e) Population census or mapping the human environment.
- (f) Tracking financial transactions.
- (g) Support to HNSF/local law enforcement for prosecution in criminal courts, international investigations for war crimes, or even military tribunals.

(2) **Forensics.** Forensics is the application of multidisciplinary scientific processes to establish facts that can be used by a JFC to support military operations. Forensic capabilities can be used to support intelligence functions, operational activities, force protection, HN legal support, and other related efforts. Forensic capabilities aid operations by adding depth and scope to the comprehensive operational picture. Exploited materials allow the linking of specific persons to places, materials, or events. The resulting information can provide usable intelligence to target, apprehend and detain, or prosecute criminals, terrorists, and enemy combatants. Other COIN related missions forensics can support include:

- (a) Force protection and population security.
- (b) Support to HN legal mechanisms.

- (c) SC.
- (d) Material sourcing.
- (e) Network engagement activities.
- (f) Site exploitation.

(3) **DOMEX.** DOMEX is the processing, translation, analysis, and dissemination of collected hard-copy documents and electronic media that are under USG physical control and are not publicly available. DOMEX supports many intelligence disciplines and activities. Examples include HUMINT, signals intelligence, and identity activities. DOMEX includes two sources of information: content of the material and (for digital media) the technical setting of the data. Content is collected in one of the 8,000 languages spoken around the world and can include a rich supply of biometric information. The content, through letters and photos, can provide significant biographical information about individuals, their interrelationships with other members of the target group, and, potentially, clues about a group's intentions. The technical setting of the data can provide firm connections between individuals and other groups. DOMEX provides support to COIN in many areas to include:

- (a) Force protection and population security.
- (b) Support to HN legal mechanisms.
- (c) SC.
- (d) Material sourcing.
- (e) Network engagement activities.

For more information on identity activities, see JP 2-01, Joint and National Intelligence Support to Military Operations, and Joint Doctrine Note 2-16, Identity Activities. For information on I2, see JP 2-0, Joint Intelligence.

4. Establish an Evolving Common Operational Picture

a. One of the ways the JFC maintains situational awareness of the OE is through a common operational picture (COP). Due to the distributed nature inherent in COIN, the COIN COP is an identical set of information/data shared by more than one command that is used to display an operational picture containing the information relevant to the needs of the commander to facilitate collaborative planning and decision making, which assists all echelons achieve situational awareness. The COP is not a real-time common presentation but is developed on parameters approved by the JFC for understanding relevant aspects of the OE by joint, and if possible, interagency and multinational partners. It provides a common awareness of the OE from which to diagnose the nature of the operational problem(s) that counterinsurgents are trying to resolve, and it helps counterinsurgents plan solutions in a synchronized manner over time and space. To be successful, a COP should

include significant interagency partners and—to the extent possible—multinational partners, key elements of the HN, and NGOs. However, dependent upon the sensitivity of some operating information and combat information and intelligence, and the JFC's and COM's information-sharing procedures, a comprehensive, overarching COP may be a challenge. The COP evolves as the operation or campaign progresses. This requires agreed upon processes for incorporating new information, updating the information that has already been accounted for, and eliminating information that is old and/or no longer accurate.

b. **Importance of a COP.** A COP supports decision making and unity of effort, a core principle of COIN. Without a shared situational awareness of relevant aspects of the OE by members of the joint force, civilian agencies, and multinational partners, separate entities within the COIN force will likely analyze problems differently, leading to uncoordinated attempts at solutions that may undermine if not conflict with one another. This diminishes unity of effort, which dilutes the richness of the COIN narrative, as projected by the COIN force's actions and messaging, and leads to the inefficient or even counterproductive use of resources. While the COP is normally maintained by the JFC, subordinate commanders and leaders may also maintain their common tactical pictures (CTPs). A CTP is an accurate and complete display of relevant tactical data that integrates tactical information from the multi-tactical data link network, ground network, intelligence network, and sensor networks. At the tactical level, the CTP is a source of situational awareness. CTP data may be used to feed the JFC's COP.

5. Joint Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment for Counterinsurgency

JIPOE is the process by which the JFC understands the OE and informs the JFC's ability to predict, appropriately respond to, and/or influence the decision-making and associated behavior of relevant actors within the OE. The four steps of the JIPOE process are: define the OE, describe the impact of the OE, evaluate the adversary and other relevant actors, and determine potential COAs of the adversary and other relevant actors. This section is not meant to replace existing doctrine for JIPOE. Instead, it discusses JIPOE with respect to COIN.

a. In many operations, the defeat of the enemy's military capabilities is the main focus of JIPOE. COIN, however, is focused on the threat (insurgents, terrorists, criminals, and their direct support), indigenous population (often representing the neutral network), and friendly forces (part of the friendly network) in the context of mitigating conditions that are driving or enabling a continuing insurgency. As explained in Chapter III, "Counterinsurgency," COIN success requires the joint force to understand and influence the decision cycles of the various actors and create effects that drive decision making by relevant actors that is consistent with reaching the desired end state.

b. Although military defeat of some of the insurgent force is important in COIN, it is only one portion of a more comprehensive approach to affect the decision-making and associated behavior among all relevant actors. Therefore, JIPOE for COIN uses the same four steps of the doctrinal JIPOE process with a focus on an insurgency and COIN.

(1) Step 1: Define the OE in the context of an insurgency and COIN.

Understand the potential for the JFC to conduct distributed operations for COIN in different geographic areas when defining the OE. There is typically great nuance within the OE at distributed locations across a broad operational area. Therefore, the JIPOE process for COIN benefits from incorporating IPB and other intelligence activities occurring at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels. To define the OE, the JFC's staff first clearly understands the purpose of the operation and the JFC's intent. Once this is established, a definition of the OE can be made.

(2) Step 2: Describe the impact of the OE on threat, neutral, and friendly capabilities. Understanding the impact of the OE means understanding its dynamics and includes understanding factors that are driving people to engage in conflict, factors that impact how the conflict plays out, and factors that may be useful for consideration during conflict resolution. JIPOE for a COIN operation is about understanding aspects of the physical factors and information environment that impact the decision-making and associated behavior of all relevant actors involved, to include the JFC. Ultimately, understanding the impact of the OE in COIN is about understanding aspects of the OE that are relevant to the decision cycles of those involved, to include USG, HN, and multinational personnel. This poses a particular challenge for the JFC, as it is difficult to analyze one's own actions with the same objectivity as the JFC is able to apply to the decision making of others. Similarly, the JFC should be conscious of the problem of the observer effect, where interacting with the population itself makes changes in the OE. This understanding enables the JFC to better shape the behavior of all actors in a manner consistent with the JFC's objectives and desired end state.

(a) Physical Factors. The ASCOPE analytical framework is often used to understand the key physical factors within the COIN OE. In COIN, the relevance of the physical and information aspects of the OE is potentially much greater than in traditional warfare. To the extent they are relevant, understanding those aspects of the physical factors within each ASCOPE category is critical in COIN. Aspects of each component of ASCOPE are understood in an operationally relevant way by understanding them with regard to the political strategy and especially their impact on the decisions of relevant actors.

1. Areas. Areas are localities or physical terrains that have direct impact on all actors. Examples include tribal regions, police districts, political boundaries, religious boundaries, territorial boundaries, military boundaries, polling stations, and government centers. Area factors may impact choices among relevant actors, such as the routes various relevant actors choose to travel, the places where relevant actors choose to settle, and the people with whom relevant actors choose to interact for various reasons. Area factors also impact the JFC's decisions during the planning and execution of operations.

2. Structures. Structures are existing infrastructure. Examples include hospitals, bridges, communications towers, power plants, dams, jails, warehouses, schools, television stations, radio stations, and print plants. For COIN, some cultural structures may be

COMMON OPERATIONAL PICTURE CONSIDERATIONS FOR COUNTERINSURGENCY OPERATIONS

The processes and procedures for establishing a common operational picture (COP) will differ for each operation or campaign. The following considerations may be applicable to a COP:

- 1. Collaborative.** A COP is developed among all relevant members of the counterinsurgency force. This means a COP is civil-military, joint, interagency, and multinational based on the participants—assuming all are present and relevant. To the extent possible, include elements of the host-nation government and the nongovernmental organization community.
- 2. Comprehensive.** A COP incorporates information from all relevant available sources to include entities from within and outside of the intelligence community. This information is fused together through a system that makes sense for the size and construct of the counterinsurgency force. To the extent possible, the process for development of a COP includes a strategy for overcoming cultural, classification, and information technology-related barriers to sharing information.
- 3. Continuity.** A COP includes systems for maintaining continuity across deployments as personnel are moved into new roles. This is particularly essential as personnel redeploy out of theater and new personnel arrive.
- 4. Evolving.** A COP includes systems for adding new information, updating information that already exists, and correcting/modifying aspects of the COP that are no longer accurate.
- 5. Process for Understanding.** A COP includes systems and processes to ensure the right people develop the understanding they need from which to plan and execute. In the development of a COP, collection, collation, and analysis are only as good as the strategy for dissemination and information management.
- 6. Focused and Tailored.** A COP accounts for the limits of personnel to absorb large amounts of data. The concept of a COP does not require every actor to know everything about the operational environment. Instead, at the operational level, a COP requires a collaborative understanding of the minimum information required to inform the operation.

Various Sources

even more vital, such as churches, mosques, national libraries, and museums. Analysis of the relevant structures includes determining why they are important with respect to their location, functions, capabilities, and application. However, more important to understand is which structures matter, what their significance is to the political strategy, and how they impact the decision-making and associated behavior of relevant actors.

3. Capabilities. Capabilities are key functions and services within societies. Relevant capabilities may include, but are not limited to, administration, safety, emergency services, food distribution, agricultural systems, public works and utilities, health, public transportation, electricity, economics, and commerce. Sewage, water, electrical, academic, trash, medical, and security infrastructure are some of the essential services that may be relevant. Capabilities often impact the security and quality of life of relevant aspects of the population and can sometimes impact decisions among the populace about whether to behave in a manner that assists a government or insurgency. It is important to realize the interdependence each of these capabilities have upon one another, as well as upon other factors within the ASCOPE evaluation. Electricity affects the ability to bring in information and fresh water; water affects the ability to maintain sewage, prevent disease, and maintain quality of life for the population. These factors are all interdependent upon one another, and any action taken against one capability must be measured by the JFC for the impact this action will have on other capabilities or factors.

4. Organizations. Organizations can be religious, fraternal, criminal, media, patriotic or service, and community watch groups. They include media, international organizations, NGOs, merchants, squatters, and other groups. Insurgents, counterinsurgents, and the population are not the only relevant actors within the OE, and the JFC works to understand the impact on the OE of those organizations that are important.

5. People. Analysts consider historical, cultural, ethnic, political, economic, and humanitarian factors when examining the people within the OE. Understanding who is where within the OE will almost always be a relevant factor in the decision cycles of each relevant actor. For example, areas where people and insurgents may transit, retreat, evade, or hide may have relevance. Knowing where squatters, the homeless, refugees, displaced persons, and outcast groups are and why they are there may also be relevant. The information environment has increased the ability of diaspora population living abroad to have a direct effect on the attitude, finances, behavior, and support of the population within the OE. The JFC should consider the attitude and beliefs of this external (to the OE) population and how they affect internal behavior.

6. Events. Events are routine, cyclical, planned, or spontaneous activities that affect the OE. Some examples are planting and harvest seasons, elections, changes in government, key leader succession, economic reforms, political reforms, holidays, observances, anniversaries of key historical events, riots, and trials. Events may spur an increase or decrease in insurgent attacks. For example, insurgents may escalate violence to prevent an election, or insurgent activity may decrease during a harvest season as they assist the population. Combat operations, including indirect fires and deployments and redeployments, also affect the OE. JIPOE helps determine which events are relevant and how events help shape the behavior of relevant actors. Some factors to consider may be the political, economic, psychological, environmental, and/or legal implications of each event.

(b) Information Environment

1. Understanding the information environment is paramount in COIN as it is the medium through which decision making is made and disseminated. The information environment is the aggregate of individuals, organizations, and systems that collect, process, disseminate, or act on information. All relevant actors in the OE affect the information environment and are impacted by it. The most important attribute of the information environment is that it is where the actions and the messaging of all relevant actors combine to form the narratives that impact the mental disposition of relevant actors. The JFC works to understand the information environment to address a narrative using all appropriate channels of information flow. An understanding of this environment is also important for activities such as intercepting insurgent communications to inform operations and deterring and/or exploiting nefarious communication.

2. Those who collect information about the OE should be cognizant of how their collection efforts will impact actor perceptions. Due to the evolution in communications technology in recent decades, disproportionately small groups, to include insurgents, counterinsurgents, and elements of populations both inside and outside of the operational area, can gain asymmetric advantage in the information environment. Internet communication and exploitation of the media have proven particularly useful to insurgents hoping to shape the narrative within the operational area to their favor, recruit manpower from sympathetic individuals and other already established groups with related interests, and gain other types of resource and political assistance for their cause from outside the operational area. As mentioned earlier, the growth of social media has enabled the information environment to be expanded beyond geographical control measures still in use for joint operations. The JFC will have to contend with the shaping of the narrative from within the OE and external to the OE by the diaspora population.

3. The information environment consists of three interrelated dimensions which continuously interact with individuals, organizations, and systems. These dimensions are the physical, informational, and cognitive. Due to the political nature of COIN explained in Chapter III, "Counterinsurgency," the informational and cognitive dimensions are especially important as they extend to both US and international public opinion. COIN operations and campaigns are political armed struggles that are ultimately decided via the perceptions of the relevant actors. Ultimately, COIN is won and lost in the cognitive dimensions.

(3) **Step 3: Evaluate the adversaries and other relevant actors.** In defining the OE during COIN, an effort is made to identify the relevant actors both outside and within the operational area. The relevant actors in COIN always include the insurgents, the indigenous population, HNSF, and the HN government. However, other relevant actors may also exist. These actors might include additional insurgent or terrorist actors with regional or global ambitions, criminal elements, unofficial leaders and power brokers within the indigenous power structures, indigenous unofficial security forces (local militias), state and non-state actors in other countries, and NGOs. Globalization has led to an increase in the potential relevance of actors that reside outside of the operational area. Improvements in transport technology, the proliferation of information and communications, the deregulation of the international economy and markets, and increased migration have accelerated this phenomenon. The relevant actors and the degree to which

each actor is important to COIN are different for each operation. Actors are also dynamic, and therefore certain actors may fall under multiple categories at the same time or move from one category to another over time. As operational realities, local political dynamics, and local expectations change in response to external developments, some actors may shift their allegiances based on their own perceived interests. The impending withdrawal of third-party counterinsurgent forces can be one of the most potent triggers for realignment.

(a) Understanding the Insurgency

1. Insurgencies are products of the time, place, and society in which they develop. Understanding the insurgency in its context is necessary to develop a political-military strategy to defeat it. The opportunity/motive/means framework outlined in Chapter II, “Insurgency,” provides a starting point for understanding that context. The opportunity, motive, and means factors explain how particular aspects of the OE led to the emergence of the insurgency and shaped its strategy, organization, and narrative. Analysts can extend that analysis by examining key characteristics of the insurgent group(s) in the operational area, including its:

- a. Origins and evolution over time.
- b. Objectives, narrative, and strategy.
- c. Organization and internal decision-making structures.
- d. Approach to co-opting local disputes.
- e. Extent of factional animosity and internally competing entities.
- f. Relations with the population and civil society (such as informal governance structures, trade and professional organizations, ethnic or religious institutions, and sports clubs).
- g. Distinction between the insurgency military wing and political wing.
- h. Relations with key local, regional, or transnational business interests/economic sectors.
- i. Recruiting and resource/logistics base.
- j. Relations with various HN government and nongovernmental institutions.
- k. Relations with other states in the region.

WHO IS WINNING? A BATTLE OF MINDS AND PERCEPTIONS

V. Who is Winning?

1. A Battle of Minds and Perceptions

a. Not a game with points on a scoreboard

The answer to this question depends on who you ask. This is not like a football game with points on a scoreboard; it is more like a political debate, after which both sides announce that they won. That matters because we are not the scorekeepers: not NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] ISAF [International Security Assistance Force], not our governments, and not even our press. The perception of all of these entities will matter and they will affect the situation, but ultimately this is going to be decided in the minds and perceptions of the Afghan people, of the Afghan government, and of the insurgents, whether they can win or are winning, and, most important, the perception of the villager who casts his lot with the winner.

b. Villagers make rational and practical decisions

Villagers are supremely rational and practical people: they make the decision on who they will support, based upon who can protect them and provide for them what they need. If a villager lives in a remote area where the government or security forces cannot protect them from coercion or harm from insurgents, he will not support the government—it would be illogical. Similarly, if the government cannot provide him with rule of law, the basic ability to adjudicate requirements legally, or just enough services to allow him to pursue a livelihood, it is difficult for him to make a rational decision to support the government. The Taliban is not popular. It does not have a compelling context. What it has is proximity to the people and the ability to provide coercion and, in some cases, things like basic rule of law, based upon the fact that they are there and can put themselves in that position. The perception of the villager matters in terms of which side he should support, so winning the battle of perception is key.

c. Allowing the facts to speak for themselves

I also think that winning the battle of perception, as it applies everywhere but particularly to us, is about credibility. As I told you, the situation is absolutely not deteriorating by every indicator, but I will not stand up and say that we are winning until I am told by indicators that we are winning. For me to stand up and claim good things that are not supported by data in order to motivate us and make us feel good very rapidly undermines our credibility. Our own forces are smart enough to do that, so I intend to tell people the best assessment that we can, as accurately as possible, and allow the facts to speak for themselves.

SOURCE: International Security Assistance Force Commander, General Stanley McChrystal, October 1, 2009, Speech at the International Institute for Strategic Studies, London

l. Relations with other local and transnational non-state actors (such as criminal groups, diaspora communities, terrorist networks, and global religious authorities).

m. Perceptions of the US and other members of the joint, interagency, international, and multinational community.

n. Variation in these characteristics across different factions and/or regions.

o. Propensity and capability to capture or take US or allied military or civilian personnel hostage.

2. Gaining an understanding of these aspects of the insurgency and how they interrelate will help analysts and planners progress from a broad understanding of the OE to an accurate COG/CC/CR/CV analysis during JIPOE and subsequent network analysis to support COA development.

See JP 5-0, Joint Planning, for additional information regarding operational design.

(b) Understanding the Population

1. Understanding the population is critical for counterinsurgents. The population is fundamental for counterinsurgents seeking to establish or maintain legitimacy to garner consent of the governed. As described in earlier chapters, some level of civilian cooperation is required to locate insurgents and influence their behavior. How counterinsurgents pursue civilian cooperation will have repercussions affecting the civilian population; there is risk for potential increased support for the insurgency stemming from insurgent retribution against the cooperative populations or alienation of certain segments of the population.

2. Although the key characteristics of the population can vary enormously from one HN to another, or even within a given operational area, the two constants of security and identity discussed below apply more generally and guide efforts to understand the decision making of populations caught up in an insurgency:

a. Whatever their political preferences at the outset of the conflict, civilians tend to cooperate with whichever side is able to establish effective control. For civilians, control means creating conditions that are predictable and acceptable—a clear set of rules that are consistently enforced under which they feel they can reasonably survive. For civilians, this encompasses both immediate physical security and access to other essentials of survival (such as food and shelter) and their prospects for security over the longer term. It also encompasses the full range of potential threats, including insurgents; criminals; paramilitary groups; and the HNSF, to include multinational and counterinsurgent forces. In situations where neither insurgents nor counterinsurgents can establish effective control, civilians will often try to remain neutral to survive.

b. To understand the civilian population, the counterinsurgent works to understand the perspective of the local population, even when it is completely at odds with HN government, US, or international organizations assessments. This means understanding how locals interpret the actions of insurgents, the HN government, and all other parties influencing the conflict, including the USG and other external counterinsurgents, as well as NGOs and private-sector corporations. Developing that perspective requires understanding that US actions may not be interpreted in the same way as intended and the US will be seen as endorsing any harmful actions taken by its HN partners that the US does not specifically disavow and take visible actions to address.

c. Culture and identity complicate the challenge of understanding the perspective of the civilian population. Faced with the uncertainty and insecurity associated with civil conflict, civilians pursue their interests rationally; their decisions are consistent with their assessment of the current local environment and how it is most likely to evolve. That assessment is heavily shaped by a range of contextual factors that include both individual and communal characteristics such as past experiences, dominant historical narratives, normative beliefs, access to information, socioeconomic factors, and the degree to which individuals are dependent on membership in their communities for survival. Often these are bundled together under the category of “culture.”

d. Many of these factors are derived from the identity that individuals and communities have adopted. As described above, identity can shape how those individuals and communities define their interests and what they consider the best or most plausible ways to pursue them. Therefore, counterinsurgents seeking to shape the decisions and behavior of civilians work to understand the group identities and their role in local power dynamics.

e. Identities are rarely stable or immutable. They often evolve or are deliberately manipulated in the course of civil conflict. As described in Chapter II, “Insurgency,” identities are employed strategically by individuals, communities, and insurgents to justify the actions they take to pursue their interests, even as those interests are shaped by identity. Interests and identity shape each other. As a result, counterinsurgents consider identities as both a target to be influenced and as a tool to shape the perceptions of the population. In working to reshape the political dynamics driving the insurgency, counterinsurgents consider whether their actions will bolster, undermine, or alter identities, and how that in turn will affect the support of the civilian population.

f. To understand the population, counterinsurgents seek to understand the range of factors that shape its perceptions and behavior, including the relationships between those factors (i.e., the interdependence between geographic, demographic, social, cultural, political, economic, and institutional aspects of the population). The characteristics of the population that analysts and planners may consider include:

- (1) Demographics, social divisions, and physical environment.

(2) Politically relevant identities and communities that may be based on any one or combination of ethnicity, class, caste, tribe/clan, belief system, geographic region, education, ideology, or profession.

(3) Exchanges and economic activity, sources of income (informal and formal), and employment.

(4) The identity and selection criteria for political and social elites at local, provincial, and national levels.

(5) Relations with the HN government, including:

(a) Variations in social contract/expectations of government across different regions/sectors of society.

(b) Variations across different HN government institutions (e.g., the judiciary, police, military, internal security services, municipal/district governments, and parliament).

(c) Level of access/participation in government at various levels.

(d) Relations between informal or civil society leaders and formal government.

(e) Historical and current grievances and attempts to resolve them.

(6) Connections with diaspora communities.

(7) Civilian perceptions of the US and other members of the joint, interagency, international, and multinational community.

(8) Relations with/perceptions of the insurgency, especially as it relates to the interests of specific communities.

(9) Relations with/perceptions of other regional state and non-state actors.

(c) Understanding the HN Government

1. In most cases, US involvement in COIN has been in support of the HN government. A key lesson from those cases is the importance of understanding the strengths and shortcomings of the HN government and accounting for them in developing the strategy planning the operation or campaign. Insurgencies emerge in response to inability or unwillingness of governments to provide for the population and control their territory in a way that minimally meets the expectations of their citizens. Often this reflects deeply rooted problems that HN elites have proven unwilling to recognize or address

because doing so would threaten their political or economic interests. Moreover, HN government leaders and factions typically seek to co-opt US assistance and combat power to promote their own political and personal interests. Such manipulation has the potential not only to undermine COIN in the immediate conflict but to damage US credibility more broadly with domestic and international populations.

2. Ideally, the US could avoid supporting HN governments that are not willing to undertake the necessary reforms. However, strategic interests may dictate otherwise, and HN governments are not monolithic, even where some parts of the HN government are cooperative, other parts may resist. Thus, a core challenge for the US is to foster the willingness within the HN government to reform institutions and governance—including, but not limited to, security forces—to address the root causes of the insurgency. This will often require a deliberate approach to empowering moderates and reformers while marginalizing hardliners within the HN government.

3. To structure US military engagement, advisory efforts, and assistance in ways that will encourage HN government reform and empower competent leaders, planners attempt to understand both the formal aspects of the HN government, such as its institutional structure, and the informal aspects, such as the competing political networks within the government, or the links between government figures and business interests. Assessments of the HN government describe the different political factions within the HN government and the distribution of power among them; how the state acquires and manages resources; how government policy is made and implemented; and the relationship between the HN government and private interests, ethno-sectarian leaders, criminal groups, and insurgents. It enables planners to determine how best to work with individuals, networks, and institutions within the HN government to promote the reforms necessary for effective COIN.

4. Some considerations for analysis of the HN government include:

a. Nature of government (such as authoritarian, democratic, confessional, theocratic, monarchy, or oligarchy).

b. Sources of power and support.

c. Economic base and systems for revenue collection and distribution.

d. Structure, roles, and political interests of different institutions and levels of government.

e. Selection process/criteria for leadership.

f. Formal processes for making, enforcing, and reforming laws and policies.

g. Relationship between political, security, and judicial institutions.

**UNDERSTANDING THE INSTITUTIONAL POLITICS OF HOST-NATION
SECURITY FORCES: THE IMPACT OF THE TANDA SYSTEM ON
COUNTERINSURGENCY IN EL SALVADOR**

The El Salvadoran Armed Forces (ESAF) tradition of “tanda” complicated military-to-military advisory relations. Among ESAF officers, personalities and political orientation were more important than military competence. Each graduating class, or “tanda,” from the Military Academy was bound to lifelong loyalty to one another. In this system, each tanda moves up through the ranks together. Officers cover for one another when they step out of line. RAND analyst Benjamin Schwarz wrote: “Adding to the pernicious effects of the tanda system is the Salvadoran military’s practice of operating not through a clear chain of command but through a complex system of consensus within and between tandas. The final consequence of the tanda system is that officers are not held accountable for their actions, no matter how egregious they may be; human rights abuses therefore go unpunished, military incompetence is tolerated, and corruption runs rampant.”

**SOURCE: Major Scott W. Moore,
United States Air Force Naval Postgraduate School
Gold, Not Purple: Lessons from USAID-USMILGP Cooperation in El
Salvador, 1980-1992, December 1997**

- h. Factions/divisions among the political elite.
- i. Factions/divisions within civil service/institutions.
- j. Origins, ideologies, and aspirations of political parties.
- k. Roles, capacity, and politics of the justice system.
- l. Structure and culture of the security forces (military, police, paramilitaries, prisons).
- m. Civil-military relations.
- n. Relations with different components of the HN society (such as ethno-cultural groups and interest groups).
- o. Mechanisms for popular consultation (including elections, shuras, town halls, and audiences with local officials).
- p. Relations with multinational organizations such as corporations, diaspora networks, and NGOs.

(d) **Understanding the Role of Third Parties in the Conflict.** While the main protagonists in any insurgency are generally the insurgents, the HN government, and the population, globalization has multiplied and intensified their links with the rest of the

world. During the Cold War, that pitted East versus West in numerous insurgencies around the globe, world powers typically picked sides and supported a protagonist that best suited their national interests. The additional threat posed by transnational terrorists as a third party in nearly any conflict was highlighted by the attacks of September 11, 2001, and ensuing US efforts to counter violent extremism (VE) across a broad range of theaters. These are among the clearest examples of far-reaching globalization connectivity and its complex interdependence. Contemporary technology and commerce have increased the importance of third parties. This section considers six categories of outsiders that may impact the dynamics of insurgencies as third parties: transnational and other non-state actors, neighboring nations, international organizations, NGOs, local civil society groups, and the US and other nation-states. For each of the first three categories, analysts need to map their interests in the region and the operational area, relations with the HN government and HN population, current and historical involvement with the insurgency, and relationship with and likely reaction to US involvement.

1. Transnational Non-State Armed Groups. The presence of transnational terrorists or international organized crime groups that threaten the interests of the US is a significant consideration. Approaches that conflate the transnational threat with national insurgencies and local communities can drive them together, broadening the conflict and often providing extremists from outside the affected country a foothold to exploit. Where transnational terrorists are present, analysts carefully assess the groups' relationship to the insurgency and local communities and how to disaggregate the terrorists from the insurgents. Transnational criminal organizations may also seek to profit from the conflict by forming mutually beneficial financial or even political ties to the insurgency. In some cases, insurgencies rely on links with transnational criminal organizations to fund operations and access illicit weapons. Thus, a detailed understanding of the nature and scope of the relationship between transnational terrorist or international criminal groups and the local insurgents is critical to developing an effective operational approach.

2. Other Transnational and International Non-State Actors. A range of nonviolent categories of transnational and international non-state actors can also be important to the conflict dynamics. While these actors may not be intentionally shaping the conflict, their economic role may make them politically significant. A complete analysis should consider the role of such actors, including:

a. Diaspora networks, who may back the insurgents or be potential partners for counterinsurgents.

b. International corporations, whose activities may be a source of stability or instability, depending on the context and the perceptions of the population and HN government.

c. Transnational financial institutions, ranging from modern banks to hawala networks can play a key role in interdicting material support for insurgent groups. Hawala are informal Islamic value transfer networks that operate in many parts of the Middle East, North Africa, the Horn of Africa, and South Asia outside of formal banking and financial systems.

3. Neighboring Nations. These participants can be pivotal to the dynamics and outcomes of insurgencies. If they support the insurgents, they can provide critical access to sanctuary areas and resupply, including resources typically unavailable to self-proclaimed foreign fighters and others without formal state support. As partners for counterinsurgents, they can be equally invaluable, coordinating to control borders, cut insurgent logistic networks, interdict illicit activities, and counter the exploitation of border areas as sanctuaries. In some cases, US forces and other third-party counterinsurgents may require the support of neighboring states to establish secure aerial ports of debarkation and ground lines of communications, and permission for overflight to project power from platforms and bases located outside the operational area.

4. International Organizations. International organizations are created by formal agreement between two or more governments on a global, regional, or functional basis to protect and promote national interests shared by member states. Most international organizations are regionally focused, and as such, when member states could be adversely affected by an insurgency in their region, the organization may act collectively to deny international recognition or legitimacy, sanctuary, and support to insurgents. International organizations can act as important facilitators for cooperation among states, pressure the HN government to make difficult but necessary political reforms, impose sanctions on insurgents and their supporters, and in some cases muster and deploy multilateral expeditionary civilian and military capacities to support stabilization efforts. International organizations can also play an important role in HA and development.

5. NGOs. InterAction is an alliance organization of US-based NGOs and can serve a useful liaison function. NGOs usually adhere to the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and independence. JFC planners should respect their adherence to these principles or otherwise potentially endanger the NGO. Some NGOs may coordinate with military relief activities. Although NGOs may provide the JFC with insight, assessments, and analysis with respect to the OE and the conflict, any information provided by the NGOs to the JFC should not compromise their independence and their goal to be perceived as independent by the population.

a. Local and international NGOs conducting development work are protected as civilians from direct attack under the law of war. Such NGOs may not draw on the law of war as the legal framework for their activities and do not necessarily operate based on the same principles. However, they often attempt to remain neutral in the midst of the conflict or even conduct grassroots peace building. As a result, they can have important impacts on the civilian population and the political-economic dynamics of the conflict. Because of their typically long-term presence in operational areas, they often have detailed knowledge of the local population. Some multi-mandated NGOs do recognize the practical benefits of independence and impartiality in their role when operating in complex political environments.

b. USAID can serve as a bridge between the military and its implementing partners, which can be contractors, grantees, or cooperative agreement partners depending on the type of agreement USAID signs with the implementing organization. USAID implementing partners may include NGOs as well as for-profit

organizations, which can determine the type of relationship the JFC is able to have with the implementing partner. Since these organizations are recipients of USAID funding, they may be targeted by the opposition based on the perception they are aligned with US, multinational, or HN government interests. These organizations also face the possibility of extortion by malign actors for profit.

6. Local Civil Society Groups. These include religious institutions, cultural groups, and local aid societies that could even be considered small HN NGOs. Each can face retaliation if seen assisting COIN forces. JFCs, in coordination with the COM and HN government, determine the best way to work with these groups, if required, especially to mitigate the risks of retaliation as they coordinate with them, understanding their role in the HN society and potential for not supporting the insurgency is a plus even if they do not partner with HN government COIN. Also, such groups can be a critical source of intelligence and information about local sociopolitical dynamics, so for example, an overt hands-off approach coupled with some discreet relationships may be necessary. However, as with other HN entities, JFCs do not accept the information from local groups without pause, because they may have self-serving or particular perspectives or agendas that do not represent all components of the population.

7. US and Other Multinational COIN Partners. The commitment of the USG to support COIN by an HN government comes with strategic direction and planning guidance. The JFC's CONOPS provides guidance and intent to facilitate actions that implement that strategic guidance. USAID is the lead US development agency for all US foreign assistance. A USAID senior development advisor and deputy development advisor are assigned to USSOCOM and the geographic CCMDs to familiarize the JFC with development plans, programs, and resources, as well as the policy and strategic guidance. Planners are provided to guide their efforts, but they also are aware of and susceptible to the geopolitical and domestic US political context that may influence public opinion regarding many of the effects created by their operations. Other third-party PNs in COIN also should be expected to face that same type of situation.

a. The political nature of COIN and the global media environment significantly complicate the relationship between policy, strategy, and the operational level. Insurgents are often cunning, adaptive, and media-savvy adversaries that will seek to provoke, exhaust, and discredit US efforts in the same way as they do those of the HN government. To develop an operational approach for US and other third-party COIN that will prove resilient in the face of such adversity, operational planners need to clearly understand the JFC's guidance and intent. When operating in a multinational COIN operation, US planners understand the strategic context for their partners' involvement and incorporate those considerations into the JFC's planning process. This will provide an operational approach developed in the appropriate strategic political context by the commander and staff that accounts for the political aspects of the insurgency in the operational area and areas of interest (AOIs) and properly frames US interagency and multinational partners involvement.

b. The inner workings of other interagency and multinational partners are also important to understand. Development of an operational approach that

drives unified action should account for the strengths and limitations of all civil-military entities within the multinational force. For example, the JFC should understand whether or not a development agency is capable of and/or willing to conform to the operational approach being developed by the JFC. If not, then planning should account for this through interagency coordination. Only through a firm baseline understanding of the capabilities, processes, and procedures of each entity within the multinational force can the JFC develop an operational approach resulting in unity of effort.

c. When anticipating a contingency or crisis response requiring a COIN or FID operation in a PN, the supported JFC, in conjunction with the COM, intelligence community, and PN, should begin as early as possible focusing on open-source intelligence (OSINT) collection requirements, to include forming an OSINT cell or otherwise seeking OSINT resources. In many pre-crisis situations, those OSINT collections should be anticipated before an operation or beginning of a contingency.

(e) COG Analysis

1. A thorough understanding of the OE is essential to COG analysis. Because there are various relevant actors involved, their opportunities, motives, and means should be understood, so the JFC planners can more accurately determine appropriate points of influence. The degree to which they understand the OE will determine the level of fidelity of any COG analysis, network analysis, or other tools for developing COAs. COGs consist of certain critical factors (CCs, CRs, and CVs) that help commanders identify and analyze COGs and formulate the decisive points, lines of operation (LOOs), and LOEs to affect them.

2. The COG analysis for COIN includes understanding critical factors for friendly (US, multinational, HN, and other local) supporters, relevant populations, insurgents, other protagonists (e.g., transnational terrorists), and any external supporters for either side. In COIN, it is not enough to attack the enemy's COGs and protect your own. Influencing the behavior of outside relevant actors also requires an understanding of their COGs, CVs, CRs, and CCs.

3. One danger in reliance on a COG analysis is the possibility of losing the holistic picture of the OE and those within it. Planners cannot be tempted to reduce the analysis to a simple systems perspective. Networks, groups, and influences are not viewed in isolation. Part of the operational art associated with a COG analysis in a COIN operation is the ability to understand the effect of an action relating to a particular COG on the entire OE. While determining COGs, CVs, CRs, and CCs will certainly allow planners to focus on each particular group, it should not result in a narrow fixation with a loss of the collective perspective.

(4) Step 4: Determine potential COAs of the adversaries and other relevant actors. Based on the holistic understanding of the OE developed during the first three steps of JIPOE in COIN, insight into the decision making of relevant actors is enhanced. Decision making helps drive behavior. Thus, improved understanding of decision making enables the JFC to better determine likely COAs of the relevant actors within the OE. The

fourth step of the JIPOE process builds upon this holistic view to develop a detailed understanding of probable COAs of the relevant actors as they relate to the desired end state of the JFC. Step 4 of JIPOE for COIN asks the following questions based on the enhanced understanding gained in steps 1-3 of relevant aspects of the OE:

- (a) What are each relevant actor's desired end state and objectives?
- (b) What tasks will each actor try to complete to achieve their objectives and attain their desired end state?
- (c) How will each actor attempt to complete these tasks?
- (d) What is the likely outcome of each actor's likely actions?
- (e) How will each actor's desired end state and objectives change (if at all) based on these likely outcomes?
- (f) What are likely follow-on COAs? (As discussed in Chapter II, "Insurgency," insurgent strategies can change as the situation changes, combining various strategies or moving to entirely new approaches. A dynamic analysis of possible COAs is essential to staying within the opposition's decision cycles.)

The other bit of information was that in the wallets of one of these little hooligans was a check for £10 from the BBC. And down we went to the BBC and said, “What the bloody hell are you doing?” It turned out that this little hooligan would ring up. Having been paid by taxi drivers 50 quid to burn a bus, he then rang up the BBC and said, “There’s going to be an incident at such and such.” So the cameras were already there. War amongst the people, the theater. Nobody is in control in the sense that we think there is a master plan. So your operation should be a learning operation.

The currency of war amongst the people is not fire power. That’s the currency of industrial war. The currency of war amongst the people is information—not just intelligence, information—what you put out, what you get in.

SOURCE: General(R) Sir Rupert Smith, United Kingdom Army, former Deputy Supreme Allied Commander, North Atlantic Treaty Organization; author of *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*.

Quoted from a speech at the Carnegie Council on Ethics in International Affairs, 24 January 2007

petrol, and we would all rush in and help them. These two soldiers agreed that this was a wizard wheeze and hid in the box. We drove the Trojan Horse in. And, sure enough, we got them. A quiet conversation took place between the regimental sergeant major and these two little hooligans.

It turned out that this thing that we had been treating as IRA [Irish Republican Army] terrorism, disrupting the streets, a come-on operation so that we would be pulled in so that then we could be sniped at—that was our complete logic and understanding of it—was wholly and totally wrong. This had nothing to do with terrorism at all. It was the black taxis, and they were paying these hooligans to burn the buses so they got more trade. We hadn’t been fighting anybody. But as one clawed away at it, I learned a lot. Yes, the IRA were benefiting from this. They were able to show us as being part of the problem, because we went onto the housing estate, invaded their space, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. They were now defending and were given legitimacy because they were the defender. They were taking 10 percent off the taxi drivers, because they knew what was going on, so they got money as well.

So we then started to develop an operation, which went on for a long time—this is timeless, remember. About eight years later, I am back there, at a rather more senior level, and we knock off the whole of the financial structure of that part of the IRA. It starts with that event. As you went through the file, the opening entry was the black taxi man who was handing over the 10 percent. We found out who he was, and you’ve got the beginning of a piece of string. But it took eight years.

Intentionally Blank

CHAPTER V PLANNING

“In preparing for battle I have always found that plans are useless, but planning is indispensable.”

General Dwight D. Eisenhower
Remarks at the National Defense Executive Reserve Conference
November 14, 1957

1. General

a. **Joint Planning.** Planning for COIN applies operational art, operational design, and the joint planning process (JPP) within the Adaptive Planning and Execution enterprise. The JFC, supported by the staff, gains an understanding of the OE, identifies the problem, defines the mission, and develops an operational approach for the joint operation or campaign. The JFC coordinates the operational approach within the Joint Staff and with subordinate commanders, other applicable interagency partners, and multinational/nongovernmental entities as required in the initial planning guidance so their approach can be developed into executable plans and orders for unified action. The JFC and joint forces should develop mechanisms for interorganizational coordination of the COIN operation or campaign plan with the HN and other participants, as well as coordinating CMO, which are essential during COIN.

For other sources pertinent to planning, refer to JP 5-0, Joint Planning.

b. Planning, Coordination, and Implementation

(1) Civil-military collaboration provides the JFC with a means to understand and achieve horizontal integration across the multiple aspects of planning, execution, and assessment under a given COIN strategy. The four functional components of political, economic, security, and information contribute to the overall objective of enabling the affected government to establish control, consolidating and as necessary, transitioning that control from external intervening forces (e.g., US forces) to HN forces and from military to civilian institutions.

(2) **US Country Team.** All USG COIN strategies, plans, programs, and activities that are undertaken to support an HN government are managed through the elements of the US country team, led by the COM. The US country team is the primary interagency coordinating structure that is the focal point for unified action in COIN. The country team is the senior coordinating and supervising body, headed by the US COM, who is normally the ambassador. The COM directs, coordinates, and supervises all government executive branch employees in that country except for Service members and employees under the command of the JFC. The COM or the chargé d'affaires represents the Secretary of State as the senior diplomat accredited to the foreign government. The country team is composed of the senior member of each represented department or agency. In a foreign country, the COM is the highest US civil authority. As the senior USG official permanently assigned in the HN, the COM oversees policy oversight of all USG programs

on behalf of the President. The COM leads the country team and integrates US efforts in support of the HN. As permanently established interagency organizations, country teams represent a priceless COIN resource. They often provide deep reservoirs of local knowledge and interaction with the HN government and population.

(3) **IDAD Strategy.** Where the US supports HN efforts to counter an insurgency, COIN is normally one aspect of a larger FID mission. IDAD is the HN's plan that US FID supports; the HN does not support the US FID plan. The IDAD strategy is the overarching strategy in a FID mission.

(a) The purpose of the IDAD strategy is to promote HN growth and its ability to protect itself from subversion, lawlessness, and insurgency. IDAD programs focus on building viable political, economic, military, and social institutions that respond to the needs of society. The HN government mobilizes the population to participate in IDAD efforts. The ultimate objective is to prevent an insurgency or other forms of lawlessness or subversion by forestalling and defeating the threat; thus, IDAD is ideally a preemptive strategy. If an insurgency or other threat develops, IDAD becomes an active strategy to combat that threat. When dealing with an insurgency, IDAD programs focus on addressing the root causes, and underlying core grievances, and dealing with the actual extant insurgency.

(b) JFCs and joint planners should understand the HN's IDAD strategy if they are to plan effectively to support it. In some cases, the joint force may need to assist the HN to formulate an appropriate IDAD strategy, especially if the joint force began operations in an area of weak or no HN governance. While IDAD is the overarching strategy, the HN government below the national level needs to build the capability and capacity to support IDAD, which may necessitate civil-military support. Civil-military support may come in the form of organizations like national-level governmental assistance teams (GATs) or subnational organizations, such as the provincial reconstruction teams (PRTs) which operated in Iraq and Afghanistan.

(4) **IDAD Coordination.** Military assistance is often required to provide a secure environment to enable the activities of the COM and the country team in support of the HN's goals as expressed through the IDAD strategy. The US country team, led by the COM, is the cornerstone of US coordination with the HN. The COM, the US country team, the GCC, and other JFCs are responsible for ensuring US plans and efforts are nested within the IDAD strategy. It is important to note that there are multiple supporting actors or echelons in both the commanders' and multinational partners' FID programs.

(a) **Sovereignty.** The sovereignty of an HN must be respected. This means the HN has the authority over the manner and pace of operations conducted within its borders. Sovereignty issues are key concerns for commanders conducting COIN operations. Multinational commanders—whether US, other nation, or specifically HN—are required to lead through coordination, communication, and consensus, in addition to traditional command practices. Political sensitivities should be acknowledged. Commanders and subordinates often act as diplomats as well as warriors. Within military units, legal officers and their staffs are particularly valuable for clarifying legal

arrangements with the HN. To avoid adverse effects on operations, commanders should address all sovereignty issues through the chain of command to DOS and COM. As much as possible, sovereignty issues should be addressed before executing operations. Sovereignty issues arise in a multitude of areas including aerial and sea ports of debarkation; railheads; border crossings; collecting and sharing information; protection (tasks related to preserving the force); jurisdiction over members of the US and multinational forces basing; location and access; operations in the territorial waters, both ocean and internal; overflight rights; and police operations, including arrest, detention, penal, and justice authority and procedures. Counterinsurgents should be particularly respectful of HN sovereignty issues that cut to the heart of self-determination, governance, rule of law, and the economy. Counterinsurgents should support the HN to find their own way, exercising patience, rather than directing HN actions. This can be a point of friction between military commanders who tend to focus on short- to midterm objectives and military end states and country team personnel who tend to focus on long-term issues.

(b) **Coordinating Mechanisms.** Commanders create coordinating mechanisms, such as committees or liaison elements, to facilitate cooperation and build trust with HN authorities. HN military or nonmilitary representatives should have leading roles in such mechanisms. These organizations facilitate operations by avoiding sensitivities, reducing misunderstandings, and removing impediments. Sovereignty issues can be formally resolved with the HN by developing appropriate technical agreements to augment existing or UN Security Council resolutions or status-of-forces agreements. In many cases, embassy SC organizations, NGOs, and international organizations have detailed local knowledge and reservoirs of good will that can help establish a positive, constructive relationship with the HN.

(c) **Coordination and Support.** Coordinate and support down to the village and neighborhood level. All members of the joint force should be aware of the political and societal structures in their areas. Political structures usually have designated leaders responsible to the government and people. However, the societal structure may include informal leaders who operate outside the political structure. These leaders may be associated with economic, religious, informational, and family based institutions. Other societal leaders may emerge due to charisma or other intangible influences. Commanders should identify the key leaders and the manner in which they are likely to influence COIN and attempt to build relationships and coordination mechanisms with them.

(5) **Concept.** The IDAD strategy integrates all security force and development programs into a coherent, holistic effort. Security actions provide a level of internal security that permits and supports growth through balanced development. This development often requires change to address the root causes of insurgency. These changes may in turn promote temporary unrest; however, they are necessary for long-term success. The IDAD strategy should include measures to maintain conditions under which orderly development can take place. Similarly, addressing the root causes of the insurgency often includes overcoming the HN government's inertia against reform and capacity gaps that may be associated with core grievances. It may be difficult for US leaders to convince the HN government to reform, but these reforms are often the best way to diffuse the root causes of and support for the insurgency. An underlying assumption for

the IDAD strategy is that the threat to the HN lies in insurgent political strength rather than military power. Although the counterinsurgents should contain violent insurgent actions, concentration on the military aspect of the threat does not address the real long-term danger. IDAD efforts should pay continuing, serious attention to the political claims and demands of the population and insurgents. Military and paramilitary programs are necessary for success, but are not sufficient alone.

(6) **IDAD Functions.** The IDAD strategy blends four interdependent functions to prevent or counter internal threats.

(a) **Balanced Development.** Balanced development attempts to achieve HN objectives through political, social, economic, and other developmental programs. Balanced development should allow all individuals and groups in the society to share in the rewards of development, thus alleviating frustration due to inequities. Balanced development should satisfy core grievances that the opposition attempts to exploit. The government should take proactive steps to mitigate conditions that contribute to the internal threat and instability. COIN should strive for balanced development, as insurgents will take advantage of real or perceived development inequalities, especially through their messaging and other information-related activities. All civil-military development should account for the IDAD balanced development function, including the integration of entities such as GATs and PRTs.

(b) **Security.** Security includes all activities implemented to protect the populace, resources, and infrastructure on which it relies from the threat and to provide a safe environment for development. Security of the populace and government resources is essential to countering the threat network. Protection and control of the populace permit development and deny the threat access to popular support. The security effort should establish an environment in which the local government can provide for its own security with limited national government support; however, this security should adhere to the current legal framework. This function also includes any SFA functions that multinational forces, including the US, provide to the HN.

(c) **Neutralization.** Neutralization is a political concept that makes an organized force irrelevant to the political process. It is the physical and psychological separation of the threatening elements from the population and includes all lawful activities to disrupt, preempt, disorganize, and defeat the insurgent organization. It may involve public exposure and the discrediting of COGs during a period of low-level unrest with little political violence, may involve arrest and prosecution when laws have been broken, or can involve combat action when the threat's violent activities escalate. All neutralization efforts should observe HN legal obligations regarding rights and responsibilities. The need for security forces to act lawfully is essential for humanitarian reasons, among others. This lawful action reinforces government legitimacy while denying the threat an exploitable issue. Special emergency powers may exist by legislation or decree. Government agents should develop a compelling public narrative explaining the need for such powers and should not abuse these powers because they might lose the popular support they need. Denying the threat an opportunity to seize on and exploit grievances against the government discredits their leaders and neutralizes their propaganda.

(d) **Mobilization.** Mobilization provides organized manpower and materiel resources and includes all activities to motivate and organize popular support of the HN government. This support is essential for a successful IDAD program. If successful, mobilization maximizes manpower and other resources available to the HN government while it minimizes those available to the insurgent. Mobilization allows the government to strengthen existing institutions and develop new institutions required to respond to core and emerging grievances. All mobilization efforts should have a long-term view regarding termination, transition, or continued implementation of mobilization efforts.

(7) **Assessment.** The HN and any multinational partners should continually analyze the results of the IDAD strategy. Part of the assessment process is to establish measures of effectiveness (MOEs) and measures of performance (MOPs), as well as having a methodology to provide feedback for future planning, refinement of strategy, and continued formulation of strategic national policy. While the HN should have input into all aspects of assessment, it should take the lead in determining MOEs. MOEs measure changes in system behavior, capability, or OE. MOEs in COIN predominately focus on the population. Although the HN has the best understanding of its own culture, its views have to be balanced with the views of other multinational partners to assist in providing other perspectives. Multinational partners' perspectives are especially important if the HN government is slow to reform or has had a previous record of harsh treatment against its own citizens.

(8) **Campaign Plan to IDAD Transition.** Some situations may require the joint force to occupy territory and to provide governance through a transitional military authority. However, this authority should transition to civilian authority as quickly as the situation allows. This civilian authority could be a provisional governing authority or an international organization such as the UN. Authority could also transfer from a provisional civilian authority to an international organization as an intermediate transition. Ultimately, authority will be transferred to an HN when either a government in exile or new government is ready, although this transition may be a lengthy process to ensure continued effective governance. As with transitions in governance, there may be several military transitions. When ready, the HN will first assume the lead and then eventually take over military operations. This transition may be phased over time.

For more information, see JP 3-08, Interorganizational Cooperation; JP 3-57, Civil-Military Operations; JP 3-16, Multinational Operations; and JP 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense. For a detailed discussion regarding operational art, operational design, the elements of operational design, and the JPP, see JP 5-0, Joint Planning.

2. Additional Considerations for Counterinsurgency

There are several operations, programs, and activities that may be conducted as a part of or concurrently with COIN. These direct and indirect approaches, some of which are discussed below, and others addressed in Chapter VII, "Counterinsurgency Operations," include, but are not limited to, negotiation and mediation, SC or FID operations, (using SFA, and SA), information-related activities, CT, CMO, MISO, and conducting stability activities. Typically, all would be conducted in coordination with or under the authority

of the COM and COIN JFC to ensure unity of command of the joint force and unity of effort with and for the HN government. Additionally, each may have different C2 coordinated with the COIN JFC and appropriate liaison with the joint force to ensure synchronization or deconfliction of activities in the overarching COIN operation or campaign. Other operations related to COIN are MSO, antipiracy operations, and counterdrug operations.

a. **Negotiation and Mediation.** Leaders conducting COIN, especially CA personnel, often find themselves in the role of a mediator or even arbitrator at some point during military operations. Each role requires different attributes, but there are many common ones and the following focuses on those common attributes and techniques. At all levels, CMO use negotiation, mediation, collaboration, consensus, and relationship building to create conditions for success. The COM or chargé d'affaires is the lead USG representative in-country and should authorize JFC personnel to coordinate with HNs, international organizations, and NGOs. In decision making, the USG, having established a relationship with the HN government, should coordinate with the HN government to determine what if any root causes of the insurgency could be mitigated through HN policy or governance changes. The COM and JFC would likely be part of such discussions and the assessment of how to strengthen or optimize the HN position for negotiations. Insurgencies tend to be protracted because one of the objectives is typically to break the will of the HN or USG to continue COIN operations. As such, negotiating from a position of strength (e.g., while winning or with an advantage) for leaders conducting COIN is critical. COIN forces should also consider entering into negotiations with moderate insurgent groups or leaders to address their core grievances and move toward a cease fire or peace. This is best done by the HN or their security forces, or with their approval. At the strategic and operational levels it could be working with the HN senior military leadership to assist them in evaluating the root causes of the insurgency. In other situations, the ministerial-level officials or general officers (being advised) may be able to influence other governmental organizations that could be associated with the root causes of the insurgency. At the tactical level, this could be a key leader engagement. Key leader engagements can be used to shape and influence foreign leaders at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels and may also be directed toward specific groups such as religious leaders, academic leaders, and tribal leaders (e.g., to solidify trust and confidence in US forces). Military leaders at all levels are being asked to work with their foreign partners, usually to foster a safer society that is less of a threat internally and externally. In utilizing qualified military leaders and advisors in negotiation and mediation, it may prevent an insurgency, and garner change in a peaceful manner.

For more information regarding negotiations, refer to ATP 3-07.10/MCRP 3-33.8A/NTTP 3-07.5/AFTTP 3-2.76, Multi-Service Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Advising Foreign Security Forces, and JP 3-57, Civil-Military Operations.

b. **SC.** SC involves all DOD interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific US security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide US forces with peacetime and contingency access to a HN. These efforts can help minimize

the effects of or prevent insurgencies and thwart their regeneration. The key subsets of SC are DOD administered SA and SFA.

For more information on SC, see JP 3-20, Security Cooperation.

c. **FID.** FID is the participation by civilian and military agencies of a government in any of the action programs taken by another government or other designated organization to free and protect its society from subversion, lawlessness, insurgency, terrorism, and other threats to its security. The focus of all US FID efforts is to support the HN's IDAD program. FID conducted by conventional forces and SOF can assist the HN in reducing these contributing factors to insurgency and terrorism. FID operations can be indirect support or direct support (noncombat or combat).

For more information on FID, see JP 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense.

d. **Combating Terrorism.** Combating terrorism consists of the actions taken directly against terrorist networks and indirectly to influence and render global and regional environments inhospitable to terrorist networks. It includes CT and antiterrorism (AT). CT consists of the activities and operations taken to neutralize terrorists, terrorist organizations, and their networks. The objective of CT is to render the terrorists incapable of using violence as a means of coercing governments or societies. AT is collection of the defensive measures used to reduce the vulnerability of individuals and property to terrorist acts, to include rapid containment by local military and civilian forces. Combating terrorism also includes those proactive programs which seek to make populations less susceptible to radicalization by terrorists with the objectives of reducing recruitment and ideological support.

e. **Counter guerrilla Operations.** Guerilla warfare is characterized by offensive action. Guerrillas rely upon mobility, elusiveness, and surprise. In addition to these traits, there are other characteristics that should be mentioned: civilian support, outside sponsorship, political aspects, legal aspects, tactics, and development aspects. Counter guerrilla operations are operations and activities conducted by armed forces, paramilitary forces, or nonmilitary agencies of a government against guerrillas. The majority of counter guerrilla operations will be small unit actions. Counter guerrilla operations stress three principles. **Offensive action:** keeping pressure on insurgents, hunting them where they live, and seizing maintaining the initiative. **Mobility:** fast-moving, unburdened infantry and use of air insertion or infiltration. **Surprise:** superior mobility, operations security, and use of military deception (MILDEC) operations.

f. **Stability Activities.** The stabilization considerations of COIN are rooted in the political nature of the conflict. The primary focus should be the population, rather than the insurgents. Stabilization efforts are required to reestablish control, reduce insurgent influence, and reinforce the legitimacy for the HN government, to include perception. The political and military aspects of insurgencies are bound together: military action is valuable only where it supports the political strategy, and COIN is only as good as the political strategy they support. Tactical civil and military efforts cannot compensate for a strategy that does not match the political and operational realities on the ground or lacks support

from key stakeholders. Effective strategies address both the actual capability, capacity, and willingness of the HN government to meet the expectations of its citizens and how it is perceived by the population. The political strategy should account for the sociocultural factors of the HN population. Stability activities therefore, refer to the various military missions, tasks, and activities conducted outside the US in coordination with other instruments of national power to maintain or reestablish a safe and secure environment and provide essential governmental services, emergency infrastructure reconstruction, and humanitarian relief. Stability activities are consequently fundamental to COIN. Stability activities need to address the root causes of insurgency, as well as drivers of conflict, and are therefore essential to long-term success. Recent experience of development projects being conducted for more altruistic reasons, rather than the actual needs of the population/wants of leaders, reinforces the fact that stabilization activities need to be in reaction of an insurgent or population grievance with local buy-in for success. US military forces should be prepared to lead the activities necessary to accomplish these tasks when indigenous civil, other USG departments and agencies, multinational, or international capacity does not exist or is not yet capable of assuming responsibility. Once a legitimate civil authority is prepared to conduct such tasks, US military forces may support such activities as required with an emphasis on transition to HN or international civil authority. Integrated civilian and military efforts are essential to success, and military forces need to work competently in this environment, while properly supporting the agency in charge. Effectively planning and executing stability tasks require a variety of perspectives and expertise. DOS is charged with responsibility for a whole-of-government approach to stability that includes USG departments and agencies (including DOD), the HN, alliance or coalition partners, NGOs, international organizations, and other actors. Military forces should be prepared to work in informal or formal integrated civil-military teams that could include, and in some cases be led by, representatives from other USG departments and agencies, foreign governments and security forces, international organizations, NGOs, and members of the private sector with relevant skills and expertise.

For further details on stability activities, refer to JP 3-0, Joint Operations; JP 3-07, Stability; and DODI 3000.05, Stability Operations.

g. **PO.** For the Armed Forces of the United States, PO are crisis response and limited contingency operations involving all instruments of national power and international efforts and military missions to contain conflict, restore the peace, and shape the environment to support reconciliation and rebuilding and to facilitate the transition to legitimate governance. PO include peacekeeping operations, peace enforcement operations (PEO), peace building post-conflict actions, peacemaking processes, and conflict prevention. PO may be conducted under the sponsorship of the UN, another international organization, within a multinational force, or unilaterally.

Refer to JP 3-07.3, Peace Operations, for additional information regarding PO.

h. **Related Operations.** The complex nature of COIN often requires many types of activities and operations to effectively shape the OE and set the conditions to reach the desired end state. For example, all or part of unsuccessful PEO can transition to COIN as the situation devolves and becomes more unstable. COIN and PEO can also occur

simultaneously if some parties have agreed to peace while one or more use insurgency to reach their goals. More importantly, successful COIN can become long-term PEO as part of a larger FID framework. Other key activities and operations related to COIN are CMO, information-related activities (i.e., public affairs [PA]), MISO, MSO, counterdrug operations, and cyberspace operations.

i. There are many options to consider when conducting COIN operations: limited support/light footprint and partnering are discussed here. For additional options, see Chapter V, “Planning,” and Chapter VII, “Counterinsurgency Operations.” Each option offers a different but complementary avenue and should be weighed against the OE and the actors involved and may be used individually or in conjunction with each other.

(1) **Limited support/light footprint** is an option that leverages special operations, indigenous ground forces, and robust intelligence, as well as air support, to counter an insurgency. This avoids a large footprint of US or multinational forces in an area which, if present, may serve to alienate the population, succeed less, and cost more. With this option, an insurgency can be countered by using advisors and providing indigenous forces with assets and resources (e.g., intelligence, communications, aerial support).

(2) **Partnering** is an arrangement between US and HN forces in which they operate together to accomplish the mission while building capability and capacity. Partnering should be a union of the organizations involved. It cannot be done on occasion, when convenient, or as time permits. Nor should it be limited to periodic or occasional combat operations. Real partnering is a continuous, collective, and collaborative effort on all relevant tasks necessary to achieve a common objective. It requires mutual respect despite differences in size, skill, training, capability, or culture. In every partnership, each participant has relative strengths. Effective partnering will exploit all these relative strengths and overcome respective weaknesses. It requires flexible and innovative leaders capable of forging strong personal relationships, which are a key to successful COIN. Successful COIN partnerships are designed to end as HN forces gain the capability and capacity to stand alone. Nontraditional threats, such as the insider threat, can undermine partnering and SFA activities, as well as the cohesion of US and HN forces during the conduct of COIN operations. Strategically, they can threaten not only the US’s objectives, but also undermine the overall efforts of the international community. Tactically, the breakdown of trust, communication, and cooperation between HN and US forces can affect military capability. Eliminating and/or minimizing the insider threat, especially by proper preparation and training of forces, is critical to mission success. However, more stringent force protection controls and measures that are overtly heavy-handed should be well balanced yet culturally sensitive enough to not send the wrong message to the very people and organizations the US is trying to assist. Adversaries may view attacks against US forces as a particularly effective tactic, especially when using co-opted HN forces to conduct these attacks. While these types of “insider” attacks have been context-specific to a particular theater, JFCs should nevertheless ensure their force protection plans take into account the potential for these types of attacks and plan appropriate countermeasures as the situation dictates. To reduce the potential for insider attacks, the JFC should establish vetting procedures to identify individuals whose motivations toward the HN and USG are

in question. It is imperative to remove all non-vetted personnel from training. The insider threat can be further mitigated via counterintelligence screenings and biometric enrollments of potential military recruits and applicants for base employment. Local records checks should be part of command standard operating procedures. In certain cultures, recruits and applicants for employment can be required to submit statements from recognized and trusted elders addressing the candidate's trustworthiness. Combined action and community stability activities are two types of effective partnering techniques.

(a) **Combined Action.** Combined action is a technique that involves joining US and HN troops in a single organization to conduct COIN operations. This technique is appropriate in environments where large insurgent forces do not exist or where insurgents lack resources and freedom of maneuver. Commanders use this approach to hold and build while providing a persistent counterinsurgent presence among the populace. This approach attempts to first achieve security and stability in a local area, followed by offensive operations against insurgent forces now denied access or support.

1. Combined action can work only in areas with limited insurgent activity. The technique should not be used to isolate or expel a well-established and supported insurgent force. Combined action is most effective after an area has been cleared of armed insurgents.

2. Thoroughly integrating US and HN combined-action personnel supports the effective teamwork critical to the success of each team and the overall program.

(b) **Localized Security Activities.** The primary focus of localized security activities is the protection of the population. These activities are local-level activities using a local defense force (LDF) designed to augment wider COIN operations to reduce insurgent influence and access within the community and provide a means of local self-defense.

Refer to Chapter VII, "Counterinsurgency Operations," for more detailed discussion of combined-action and localized security activities.

3. Termination and Transitions

a. **Termination.** A COIN operation will eventually reach a conclusion, as an insurgent victory, a negotiated settlement, or an HN government victory. The termination of US combat operations can also precede any of those events. Effective COIN planning cannot occur without a clear understanding of the military end state and the conditions that should exist to end military operations. Knowing when to terminate US combat operations and how to preserve advantages for success of the HN is key to attaining the US national strategic end state. To plan effectively for termination, the supported JFC should have a shared understanding with the COM, and they should understand how the President and the Secretary of Defense intend to terminate the joint operation and ensure its outcomes endure. The more difficult aspect of military termination is probably the transition of tasks

and activities from military to civilian authorities (either interagency or multinational partners or the HN).

b. Transitional Military Authorities. In some cases, a transitional military authority may be required in UGAs, occupied territory, or an allied or neutral territory liberated from enemy forces, including insurgent or resistance movements. A transitional military authority is a temporary military government exercising the functions of civil administration in the absence of a HN civil authority. It exercises temporary executive, legislative, and judicial authority in a foreign territory. The authority to establish military governance resides with the President. US forces will only assume control prescribed in directives to the JFC. If established, the transitional military authority will eventually relinquish control of the OE, with activities assumed by the HN or another authority. It is important to plan transition from the start of the operation. For example, it will be easier to transition US detention operations to the HN if such detention operations from the start take into account HN legal framework and HN ability and resources to sustain detention facilities that might be constructed by US forces.

(1) Transition is a sequence of actions required to shift responsibility from one organization to another. Transitions require an allocated period of time that allows for the myriad of tasks to be completed. Thinking of it as a general series of actions expands the scope of transitions thinking and more accurately reflects what should occur.

(2) Effective transitions are critically important when conducting COIN operations. Whether the transition is between military units or from a military unit to a civilian agency, all involved should clearly understand the tasks and responsibilities being passed and the time expected for completion. Enabling coordination between units, agencies, organizations, etc., helps reduce the friction normally associated with transitions.

(3) During the latter phases of a COIN operation, a number of responsibilities and authorities are likely to be transferred from the supported JFC (or a transitional military authority) to the COM (and other interagency partners) and/or the HN. As the military cedes authorities to US or HN civilian control, the JFC should anticipate a period of military support to governance that could be in the form of stability activities, SC activities, and military civic action. For example, SFA and other SC activities may be required for training and advising HNSF under an SSR program, military civic action may be used for development assistance, and CA and interagency partners may work with HN counterparts to enable a seamless transition and to enable the newly established civilian governance structure to develop legitimacy and resiliency.

(4) Early identification of a collaborative transition planning team can help build the foundation for an effective transition physically, functionally, and contextually, as well as reduce its duration.

c. Political Reform. Political reform should be started as soon as feasible, even if the insurgency is still ongoing. Waiting for success will prolong the conflict, provide fodder to insurgent propaganda, and exacerbate the root causes of the insurgency. However, once the insurgent political infrastructure is destroyed, dismantled, or incorporated into the HN

existing political structure, and once local leaders begin to establish themselves, necessary political reforms can be further implemented. These aspects of COIN should ideally be led by HN civilian agencies, international organizations, or NGOs, with the military in a supporting role. The JFC should coordinate actions in these areas with the COM and the country team. The HN must be seen leading this effort to substantiate its legitimacy, build trust within the population, and avoid the appearance that the government is the puppet of a foreign power. Other tasks are to:

(1) Establish HN government agencies to perform routine administrative functions and begin improvement programs.

(2) Provide HN government support to those willing to participate in reconstruction. Participation should be based on need and ability to help.

(3) Develop regional and national consciousness and rapport between the population and its government. Efforts may include participating in local elections, making community improvements, forming youth clubs for both genders and women's groups, and executing other projects.

(4) Provide systems for safely reporting adversary or friendly acts of intimidation, violence, crime, and corruption.

(5) Establish programs for monitoring public opinion through public participation to measure social and political acceptance of governance and legitimacy of the HN government and USG support.

4. Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration Planning

a. **Planning.** Planning for a successful DDR requires an understanding of both the situation on the ground and the objectives, political will, and resources with which other relevant actors and donor organizations are willing to support. Ideally, governmental organizations and NGOs from the international community collaborate with the HN government to plan and execute DDR. Joint forces should be integrated in the planning of DDR from its inception. Effective DDR planning relies on analysis of possible DDR beneficiaries, power dynamics, and local society, as well as the nature of the conflict and ongoing peace processes. Assessments are conducted in close consultation with the local populace and with personnel from participating agencies who understand and know about the HN. The DDR planning process will vary widely depending on the conflict and the lead organization for the DDR program. The following passage outlines the four possible lead organizations for a DDR program.

(1) **HN Lead.** In some cases, such as El Salvador and Nepal, HN governments have the lead with support from the UN, other multilateral organizations (such as the World Bank), bilateral donors, and multinational forces. When the HN leads the process, supporting organizations will play an advisory role, but this should not prevent the joint force from actively participating in the process. Joint forces can provide an array of valuable supporting actions such as security, counterintelligence, intelligence, operational advisors, and financial assistance.

(2) **Multilateral Organization Lead.** In other cases, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo, the UN often leads DDR efforts due to its experience in the area. UN organizations, such as the UN Development Programme and the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations, will run the program with potential assistance from additional international or national agencies. Organizations like the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the World Bank have experts that often provide assistance designing, initiating, and monitoring DDR programs without being the main implementers.

(3) **USG Lead.** USG departments or agencies could potentially lead DDR efforts in future conflicts. DOS and USAID have had experience in a variety of DDR programs and can play a valuable role in planning and managing the complex tasks involved. Furthermore, DOS's historic role in leading police and internal security service reforms and USAID's historic role in development make both agencies extremely valuable partners whether they have the lead role or not. USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI) works to advance peace and stability in complex, dynamic environments. OTI interventions have largely focused on the "R" of DDR, where assistance can make or break a country's post-conflict transition.

(4) **US Forces Lead.** In some scenarios, US forces may have to lead a DDR program, particularly if the security situation on the ground is threatening. It is important to note that, if US forces do lead a DDR program, commanders should request assistance from relevant offices within the UN, DOS, USAID, or other agencies with experience in DDR.

b. **Allegiance.** Allegiance is an essential part of the DDR process and involves insurgent pledges, government forgiveness, and proper vetting. Formal insurgent pledges are necessary to ensure insurgents are serious about their decision and to prevent insurgents from taking advantage of DDR benefits. The government should reciprocate insurgent pledges by offering forgiveness and protection. Formal allegiance ceremonies demonstrate the HN government's commitment to the reintegration process, while also making it clear that retaliation against former insurgents is unlawful. Effective vetting procedures, such as biometric enrollment and local government involvement, will reduce the likelihood of fraudulent activities associated with the DDR process.

c. **Reintegration.** Former insurgents, when properly protected, reintegrated, and well treated, can become positive members of their community. Conversely, unprotected, poorly prepared, or poorly treated former insurgents will become powerful informational opportunities for the insurgents. The reintegration process and programs, such as HN-led moderate ideological or religious education and job training, should be factored into the planning for the reintegration process. It should also include activities that educate the public and family members about the process. Families can be a powerful influence on insurgents to leave the battlefield.

d. **Amnesty and Reconciliation.** Amnesty and reconciliation are key components to successful reintegration. In this context, reintegration cannot be divorced from justice and reconciliation programs that are part of the broader transition process and may include

community reconciliation initiatives, truth telling exercises, and forgiveness rituals. Successful reintegration programs tend to be long-term and costly, requiring the participation of multiple external and HN participants. The Chinese philosopher Sun Tzu wrote, a commander should “Build your opponent a golden bridge to retreat across.” While Sun Tzu intended this remark to illustrate how a cornered enemy will often fight more intensely than one with an escape route, this admonition can apply in a COIN context as well. Counterinsurgents should leave a way out for insurgents who have lost the desire to continue the struggle. Effective amnesty and reintegration programs provide the insurgents this avenue; amnesty provides the means to quit the insurgency, and reintegration allows former insurgents to become part of greater society. Consideration for injured populations who are most affected by the conflict are key to ensure reconciliation efforts succeed, prevent revenge killings, and/or a civil war post-conflict.

e. **Reinsertion.** Reinsertion is the assistance offered to former insurgents and belligerents prior to the long-term process of reintegration. Reinsertion is a form of transitional assistance intended to provide for the basic needs of reintegrating individuals and their families; this assistance includes transitional safety allowances, food, clothes, shelter, health services, short-term education, training, employment, and tools. While reintegration represents enduring social and economic development, reinsertion is a short-term material and financial assistance program intended to meet immediate needs. Planning efforts should include funding and manpower to support these reinsertion efforts.

f. **Repatriation.** The repatriation of foreign nationals to their country of citizenship is governed by complex US and international legal norms and standards, legal standards that likely apply differently in each case of proposed repatriation. Any program of repatriation is likely to raise important legal issues that should be reviewed by US legal personnel.

g. **Refugees and IDPs.** The return of refugees and IDPs to their homes is one of the most difficult aspects of COIN. All returns must be voluntary and safe and must occur in a dignified manner. The principle of non-refoulement must be respected at all times, irrespective if it takes place across the national border or not. If their dislocation was originally caused by ethnic or sectarian cleansing, their return risks renewed ethno-sectarian violence. Often, abandoned homes are occupied by squatters, who should be removed in order to return the home to the rightful owner. Poor real estate records and immature judicial systems and laws exacerbate the return process, as ownership should be legally established prior to return. Counterinsurgents can play a key role in transporting and providing security for returnees and often play a role in establishing temporary legal mechanisms to resolve property disputes.

5. Assessment Planning

Assessment is the continuous monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the current situation and progress of a joint operation toward mission accomplishment. It involves deliberately comparing forecasted outcomes to actual events to determine the overall effectiveness of force employment. In general, assessments should answer two questions: Is the JFC doing things right? Is the JFC doing the right things? More specifically,

assessment helps JFCs determine progress toward achieving objectives and whether the current tasks and objectives are relevant to reaching the end state. It helps identify opportunities, counter threats, and any needs for course correction, thus resulting in modifications to plans and orders. Planning for a continuous assessment process in COIN begins during the initial steps of the JPP and should include assessment and assessment reporting at all echelons.

For more discussion on assessment, see Chapter VI, “Assessment,” and JP 5-0, Joint Planning.

Intentionally Blank

CHAPTER VI ASSESSMENT

“It would be difficult (if not impossible) to develop a practical, centralized model for COIN [counterinsurgency] assessment because complex COIN environments cannot be clearly interpreted through a centralized process that removes data from their salient local context.”

Ben Connable
Embracing the Fog of War, 2012

1. Introduction to Assessing a Counterinsurgency Operation or Campaign

Assessment is the continuous M&E of the current situation and progress of a joint operation toward mission accomplishment. It involves deliberately comparing forecasted outcomes to actual events to determine the overall effectiveness of force employment. In general, assessments should answer two questions: Is the JFC doing things right? Is the JFC doing the right things? More specifically, assessment helps JFCs determine progress toward achieving objectives and whether the current tasks and objectives are relevant to reaching the end state. It helps identify opportunities, counter threats, and any needs for course correction, thus resulting in modifications to plans and orders. This process of continuous assessment occurs throughout the JPP.

a. **Operation Assessment.** Operation assessment offers perspective and insight and provides the opportunity for self-correction, adaptation, and thoughtful results-oriented learning. COIN operation assessment requires an integrated approach to support commander and policy maker decisions regarding the implementation and resourcing of operations to accomplish strategic objectives. From operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, the Philippines, and the Horn of Africa, principles of operation assessment have emerged to support operation planning and execution across multiple echelons. The COIN operation assessment process detailed in this chapter provides these basic principles to integrate staff and intelligence perspectives through the planning and execution cycle of operations. Effective assessment is necessary for counterinsurgents to recognize changing conditions and determine their significance to the progress of the COIN operation. It is crucial to the JFC’s ability to identify anticipated and unanticipated effects and successfully adapt to the changing situation. A continuous discourse among counterinsurgents at all echelons provides the feedback the senior leadership needs to appropriately adapt operations to the current situation.

b. **Learning and Adjusting.** Commanders should be attuned to a change in the OE (particularly in the political realm) that may cause the initial plan of the operation to be in question. Often times, these changes will occur independently and will not necessarily be linked in any way to the actions of the joint force and multinational partners. In an ideal world, the commander of military forces conducting COIN operations would enjoy clear and well-defined operation or campaign end states from the beginning to end. The reality is that, with the political volatility inherent in COIN operations, many objectives emerge only as the operation or campaign develops. Environmental conditions may develop that

did not exist during planning of the COIN operation or campaign that require changing previous frames of reference and operational objectives. Consequently, operational assessment in COIN requires balancing disciplined process with analytical flexibility to facilitate operational adaptation.

c. The Purpose of Operation Assessment in COIN

(1) Assessment of a COIN operation is a key component of the commander's decision-making cycle. It helps the JFC determine changes within the OE, as well as the results of tactical, operational, and strategic actions, in the context of overall mission objectives. During the planning process, operation assessments inform the commander's decisions to employ limited resources to attain defined military end states. The decision to adapt plans or shift resources is based upon the integration of the intelligence assessment of the OE and staff estimates of the joint force's ability to conduct operations in pursuit of the end state. However, the complex, dynamic, and uncertain nature of COIN operations mean some end state conditions may be ill-defined or change while the operation progresses.

(2) During planning, the commander and staff describe the current conditions of the OE, describe the desired conditions at the end state of an operation, and identify the barriers that prevent the establishment of the desired conditions. The commander and staff develop an assessment plan to focus and integrate information from various sources to reduce the uncertainty of their observations and conclusions about the OE. This information may be derived from interagency partners, multinational partners, the HN government, subordinate commands, NGOs, and various intelligence sources.

(3) In COIN operations, it is difficult to isolate the effects of specific actions. The commander and staff focus information requirements to answer specific questions about the operation plan, and they develop the assessment plan using the same structure as the operation plan. The integration of operation planning and assessment links joint force actions to changes in observed conditions within the OE to support the commander's decision cycle and adapt future plans.

(4) The outputs of an assessment communicate the effectiveness of the operation plan toward desired end states, describe risks involved in the accomplishment of the plan, and recommend necessary changes to the plan to attain a desired end state. Additionally, assessments help the commander to report observations and conclusions about the impacts of the operation plan and make recommendations to senior commanders or policy makers.

d. Use of Operation Assessment. Effective operation assessments link the employment of forces and resources to intelligence assessments of the OE. Properly executed assessments allow the commander to do the following:

- (1) Compare observed OE conditions to desired end state conditions.
- (2) Determine whether key planning assumptions are still valid.

(3) Determine whether the desired effects have been created and the objectives have been achieved.

(4) Determine the effectiveness of resources allocated against objectives.

(5) Determine whether a decision point has been reached.

(6) Identify the risks and barriers to mission accomplishment.

(7) Identify opportunities to accelerate mission accomplishment.

(8) Develop recommendations for branches and sequels.

(9) Communicate the evaluation of the plan to the higher headquarters, staff, subordinate units, policy makers, interagency partners, and others as necessary.

e. Assessment Complexities in COIN

(1) In traditional operations, operation assessment tends to involve a calculation of the current state of the OE, MOPs, and MOEs with regard to primarily military objectives and the military operational end state. This is not the case in COIN, because military objectives, while important, are just one key aspect of the broader HN's political objectives of a COIN operation.

(2) Operation assessments in COIN differ from assessments of many traditional operations because success of the operation often relies on nonmilitary factors and factors outside of the joint force's direct control. This increases the focus on diplomatic, informational, and economic objectives. As with traditional operations, the operation assessments will link the performance of the joint force to the conditions of the current OE. This helps the joint force estimate the impacts of its actions on the environment. The military aspect of a COIN operation is important because it helps to create the conditions for achievement of diplomatic, informational, and economic objectives and attainment of end states. Because the LOEs and LOOs within COIN are interdependent, the impact of military actions can be difficult to isolate in the OE. Often, this requires that the joint force determine progress toward these objectives to understand the relationships that exist between nonmilitary and military objectives.

(3) COIN operations often involve complex political and societal issues that may not lend themselves to quantifiable MOEs; therefore, assessment staffs in COIN should have skill sets in operationally relevant qualitative research analysis. This includes a degree of area knowledge specific to social science skill sets and an understanding of COIN and/or operational relevance in COIN analysis.

(4) The JFC and staff should establish which assessment factors within the OE are important and ascertain the status of these factors with regard to the COIN operation's objectives and end state. The complexity of COIN operations usually does not allow for uniform or quantifiable MOEs. Because no two COIN operations and no two locations within an operational area are the same, all COIN operations should be assessed on their

own merits. The JFC and staff should continually develop and enhance their understanding of the OE to identify the key factors particular to their operation.

2. Organizing for Assessment

Assessment planning is normally the responsibility of the lead planner for the joint planning group/operations planning team. Once the plan is operationalized, a range of cross-functional expertise is required to analyze progress toward the desired effect, objectives, and end state. There are numerous methods for organizing a staff to conduct operation assessment in COIN. At each of the senior headquarters in Iraq and Afghanistan, commanders utilized assessment cells, teams, and working groups to develop the assessments methodology and compile relevant data from subordinate units, their staffs, and interagency and multinational partners to develop the assessment plan. Assessments are commander-centric and require integration and feedback mechanisms within the organizational battle rhythms to inform decisions and necessary shifts in the operational plan. The supported CCMD and its associated Service components' headquarters have the authorities and are typically responsible for as detailed and accurate assessment as possible. Those headquarters typically have more capability for analysis of MOEs than the subordinate JTF or Service units, which provide MOPs, and perhaps some MOEs, for higher-level analysis. Subordinate units may have a reduced capability to assess MOEs, depending on horizontal and vertical support requirements for assessment input and/or output products. Within a COIN operation, more robust assessment capabilities at the JTF level and below may be required. A properly designed and coordinated assessment plan is essential for all levels of the assessment process. Devoting appropriate priority to the art and science of assessing progress (or lack of it) will help the commander know if the operation is proceeding as planned or requires modification to accomplish the desired end state and mission. At the strategic level, it is common for assessments reporting to be levied by the organization's higher headquarters. Planning for these requirements in advance will reduce the unanticipated burden to a commander's staff.

3. The Assessment Process and Assessment Plan

a. Relevant factors for assessments in COIN are rarely uniform across regions and operational phases. In previous COIN operations, the JFC assessment process attempted to develop operational-level metrics for the entire OE. Because the importance of relevant factors was highly localized, and in some cases, not applicable, an indicator of progress in one location did not necessarily hold true for other locations. Relevant factors for assessment of a given area may change over time due to changes in the OE that may, or may not, be related to actions by the JFC. An operation assessment process should include established standard operating procedures for dissemination of localized assessments through the various higher headquarters. Each headquarters falling under the joint operational command should produce its own assessments that incorporate the lower level assessments they receive and disseminate their own assessment, along with the original lower-level assessments higher up the chain. Only through this process can assessment at the operational level account for the nuance in local context and the varied nature of the conflict spanning the entirety of the operational area.

b. To account for the differences between various locations within a given operational area, COIN operations require decentralized command structures. This principle extends to the operation assessment planning for COIN. Operation assessment in COIN relies on those with the most in-depth knowledge of specific locations within the operational area, usually subordinate units, to identify and assess factors relevant to their localities. The joint force should structure the assessment plan to incorporate the reporting and assessments of subordinate commands without being prescriptive as to what information is collected or how it is analyzed.

c. **Metrics and Generating Effects.** LOEs should aim to generate discrete effects (social, political, security) in support of COIN objectives. For example, insurgents may function as providers of economic benefits to the population through pay for participation, hand-outs, and other opportunities for extortion. Where this is the case, economic and infrastructure development LOEs should aim to replace the insurgents with more benign structures. Metrics used to measure the impact of such efforts need to be based on the desired effect. Experience has shown that simply measuring infrastructure outputs (e.g., miles of road laid, number of schools built) tells the counterinsurgents little about their effect on the insurgency. Equally important, economic and infrastructure projects are bound to produce both winners and losers. Counterinsurgents will have to be cognizant of both, and plan for likely second- and third-order effects as a result.

d. **The Operation Assessment Process**

(1) The assessment process operates during the planning and execution cycle. The steps of the assessment process are the inputs and outputs of each step, the primary personnel involved in the step, and where in the planning and execution cycle the step occurs. This process supports the clear definition of tasks, objectives, and end states, and gives the staff a method for selecting the commander's critical information requirements (CCIRs) that best support decision making.

(2) The basic steps of the operation assessment process are integrated into the commander's decisions for operations.

- (a) Develop the operation assessment approach.
- (b) Develop operation assessment plan.
- (c) Collect information and intelligence.
- (d) Analyze information and intelligence.
- (e) Communicate feedback and recommendations.
- (f) Adapt plans or operations/campaigns.

e. **Develop the Operation Assessment Approach**

(1) The assessment process begins during mission analysis or operational design when the staff begins to identify the operational variables needed to understand what to measure and how to measure it. Each element of the operational plan directs resources against a particular action with an intended effect. Information is needed to understand whether planned actions were executed, and intelligence is needed to interpret changes to the targeted aspect of the OE.

(2) The staff selects an operational variable framework (e.g., ASCOPE) to describe its understanding of current conditions and desired conditions within the OE. Clearly understood end states are critical to measuring progress in a COIN operation or campaign. However, COIN operations and campaigns rarely have well-defined end states. Poorly defined end states can produce poorly defined plans and assessments. This creates a situation where effectiveness of the COIN operation is difficult to ascertain, and the result is an increased risk in wasting time, resources, and opportunities to successfully accomplish the mission. To address this, the staff should define specific objectives in terms of the operational variable framework. This links ill-defined end states to assumptions about the observable behaviors necessary to determine progress toward those end states. These observable behaviors should be translated into information and intelligence requirements and integrated into the operation plan as CCIRs.

(3) As part of operational design or the operational framework and to clarify the connections between assumptions, operations, and end states, the staff should clearly articulate how they believe the operation will lead to the desired end states. Because of the uncertain nature of COIN operations, a better understanding of the OE may develop over time, providing an opportunity for better operation plans. Assessment can facilitate this by explicitly describing the critical assumptions upon which the operation was planned. These assumptions can be tested and refined in ways that will create opportunities to improve the plan and, consequently, to reach the end state.

(4) At the start of a COIN operation or campaign, the commander and staff develop a baseline assessment. The baseline provides an understanding of the initial conditions of the environment. During planning, a baseline assessment allows the commander and staff to set objectives for desired rates of change within the environment and thresholds for success and failure. This focuses information and intelligence collection on answering specific questions relating to the desired outcomes of the plan.

(5) Figure VI-1 compares the perspectives, sources, uses, and results of information and intelligence. These distinctions in external versus internal focus show that intelligence is used to understand the environment, and information from staff and subordinate command reporting is used to determine if the joint force executes operations according to plan. The operations assessment provides comprehensive internal and external perspective of the joint force's impact on the OE.

(6) Nonmilitary aspects of the OE are critically important in COIN operations. Information derived from multiple sources may be focused to address specific questions about nonmilitary relationships within the OE. Answering these questions will not allow the commander or staff to determine a cause-and-effect relationship between joint force

Comparison and Use of Information and Intelligence

	Information	Intelligence
Perspective	Internal focus.	External focus.
Sources	Staff section and subordinate command reports, host-nation reports, NGO information.	All-source intelligence, intelligence agency reports, host-nation reports.
Use in Plans	Friendly force information requirements assumptions linking force posture to operations.	Priority intelligence requirements assumptions linking operations to effects.
Use in Assessments	Determines if plan is executed properly.	Determines if plan is creating desired conditions.
Result of Assessments	Resource efficiency of the plan.	Resource effectiveness of the plan.
Example of IIRs	Allocation of coalition trainers to train HNSF within a specific region. Readiness assessment of HNSF.	Security assessment within a particular region.
Example of Assessments	Estimation of best number of trainers for a type of HNSF unit at a specific capability rating.	Estimation of HNSF ability to sustain security within a given region.
Example of Conclusions	Helps staff to estimate if coalition trainers increase/decrease/have no impact on the HNSF ability to provide security for a given region.	
Example of Decision Requirements	Increase/decrease/do not change the level of multinational training support to HNSF within a given region.	

Legend

HNSF host-nation security forces

NGO nongovernmental organization

IIR information and intelligence requirement

Figure VI-1. Comparison and Use of Information and Intelligence

actions and observation with OE. However, it will aid in developing insights into expected behaviors and inform the understanding of the OE.

(7) Assessment questions should be directly linked to the desired operating conditions articulated during the operational design process. When possible, the staff that develops the desired end state conditions should also develop the assessment questions during the planning process, with the commander’s direct participation. Examples of assessment questions for COIN are:

(a) **Security Conditions.** Has sufficient security been established to sustain stability?

(b) **HNSF.** Can the HNSF (in a specified area) handle local security requirements without joint force or multinational force assistance?

(c) **HN Governance Capacity.** Is there sufficient HN government control, rule of law, and stability to prevent reemergence of an insurgent threat?

(8) The staff should develop assessment questions based upon the critical assumptions laid out during planning. This links the operation assessment to the structure of the operation plan, intended actions, and the expected outcomes. These questions allow the staff to validate or invalidate assumptions made during planning as they play out in execution.

(9) Assessment questions test the assumption that define the cause (action) and effect (result) relationship between operational activities and end states. If expected progress toward an end state does not occur, then the staff may conclude that the intended action does not have the intended effect. The uncertainty during COIN makes the use of critical assumptions particularly important, as operation planning may need to be more dynamic for elements of the OE which are initially not well understood when the plan is developed. In some cases, if an aspect of the OE is particularly uncertain, assumptions not used in the operation plan may be tested to trigger a change to the operation plan if those assumptions bear out. If information indicates actions are executed as planned, but intelligence indicates the intended end state is not being reached, then the assumptions may need to be revisited to improve the operation plan. Once the assessment can identify an incorrect assumption, steps can be taken to improve the operation plan by identifying the fault, correcting the assumption or the logical relationship, and adjusting the subsequent operations and activities.

(10) Going through this process helps the staff to determine knowledge and information gaps and helps the staff gauge the value of the information and intelligence they collect. This process also helps eliminate redundant and obsolete reporting requirements for subordinate units. An information or intelligence requirement can either be quantitative or qualitative. In either case, the information or intelligence requirement should add value to a specific decision in the commander's decision-making cycle. Explicitly collecting information or intelligence requirements for assumptions, execution, and OE response enables better revisions to the operation plan. Sample questions to determine the value of proposed information and intelligence requirements could include:

(a) **Usage.** What aspect of the operations plan does this information or intelligence requirement inform? What decision does it support?

(b) **Source.** How will the information or intelligence requirement be collected? Who is collecting the information or intelligence requirement? What is our confidence level in the reporting?

(c) **Cost.** What is the cost of collection (e.g., the risk to forces, resources, and/or mission)?

(d) **Time.** When is the information or intelligence requirement no longer valuable?

(e) **Impact.** What is the impact of knowing the information or intelligence requirement? What is the impact of not knowing the information or intelligence requirement? What is the risk if it is false?

(f) **Comparison.** Is this a primary or secondary indicator of operational actions or effects? If the information or intelligence requirement is unavailable, are there other information or intelligence requirements that can serve as proxies?

(11) As the planning process continues, the staff develops objectives, defines the effects to be created that include observable changes they expect to see to achieve those objectives, and proposes tasks to be executed to create effects. The staff determines the information and intelligence requirements that will fuel the collection plans that support the assessment plan. Well-defined objectives establish a single desired end state; link directly or indirectly to higher-level objectives or to the end state; are prescriptive, specific, and unambiguous; and do not infer ways and/or means (i.e., they are not written as tasks). Joint force components support the planning process because they will execute the tasks and have their assessment requirements.

f. **Develop Operation Assessment Plan**

(1) Effective assessment design allows for more concise and well-defined plans and communicates a clear understanding of the actions necessary to attain the desired end state and the underlying assumptions linking action to end state. Assessment plans link the intelligence estimates of the current OE conditions to information about friendly force status and actions. A well-designed assessment plan will include (at a minimum) the following planning activities:

(a) Develop the commander's assessment questions.

(b) Document the selection of operational variables during mission analysis.

(c) Document the development of information and intelligence requirements.

(d) Document the definition of the end state in terms of acceptable conditions, rates of change, thresholds of success/failure, and technical/tactical triggers.

(e) Identify tactical-level considerations; link information and intelligence requirements to commander's intent, end states, objectives, and decision points.

(f) Identify strategic and operational-level considerations; in addition to tactical-level considerations, link assessments to LOOs and the associated desired conditions.

(g) Document collection and analysis methods.

(h) Establish methods to evaluate triggers to the commander's decision points.

(i) Establish methods to determine progress toward the desired end state.

(j) Establish methods to estimate risk to the mission.

(k) Coordinate development of recommendations for plan adjustments, branches, and sequels.

(l) Establish the format for reporting assessment results.

(2) When selecting the general framework for planning the assessment, the joint force staff should consider how CCIRs will be integrated into the decision-making process, how the commander prefers to view information, and the complexity of the OE. Regardless of which technique the commander and staff select, it should allow the staff to convey the nonlinear relationships between diplomatic, informational, military, and economic objectives (or whichever framework the operation plan uses); highlight risks and opportunities; summarize decision recommendations; and integrate multiple sources of qualitative and quantitative information and intelligence requirements.

(3) Part of assessment planning involves connecting specific assessment questions to critical assumptions regarding the relationship between the actions and the end state. Identifying the appropriate level of detail to use when describing assumptions can be challenging and can require iteration to get right. Too many information and intelligence requirements make the assessment plan burdensome and unmanageable. On the other hand, poor definition of critical assumptions means the staff is not getting enough information or intelligence to understand the impacts of actions on the OE. In turn, this wastes opportunities to address problems and improve resource allocation.

g. Collect Information and Intelligence Requirements. During mission execution, the joint force uses the collection plan and defined reporting procedures to gather information about the OE and the joint force's actions as part of normal C2 activities. Typically, staffs and subordinate commands provide information about plan execution on a regular cycle. Intelligence staffs provide intelligence about the OE and operational impact both periodically and responsively to decision triggers. In accordance with the assessment plan, the assessment team assists the planning and intelligence staff with determining the presence of decision point triggers and coordinates assessment activities across the staff.

h. Communicate Feedback and Recommendations

(1) At some point during mission execution, the commander and/or the staff may recognize the conditions of the OE do not reflect those conditions anticipated by the plans. Based upon a current assessment of the OE, a staff can estimate the effect of force and resource allocation, determine whether key planning assumptions are still valid, determine whether objectives are being met, or determine if a decision point has been reached. Based

upon these determinations, the staff may identify the risks and barriers to mission accomplishment or identify opportunities to accelerate mission accomplishment.

(2) The assessment team develops an assessment report and develops recommendations for the commander based upon the guidelines set forth in the assessment plan. Assessment reports serve the functions of informing the commander about current and anticipated conditions within the OE, the ability of the joint force to impact the OE, and communicate progress to multiple partners in the COIN operation. When possible, the commander should use the assessment report as part of the CCS plan by declassifying key findings for communication with a broad audience.

i. **Adapt Plans or Operations/Campaigns.** All of the conclusions generated by the staff evaluations regarding end state accomplishment, force employment, resource allocation, validity of planning assumptions, and decision points lead to the development of recommendations for continuation, branches, sequels, or conclusion to the current order or plan. Assessments inform changes to improve the conduct of operations and effectiveness of plans by informing the following decisions:

- (1) Update, change, add, or remove critical assumptions.
- (2) Transition phases.
- (3) Execute branches and sequels.
- (4) Reallocate resources.
- (5) Adjust operations.
- (6) Adjust orders, objectives, and end states.
- (7) Adjust priorities.
- (8) Change priorities of effort.
- (9) Change support commands.
- (10) Adjust command relationships.
- (11) Adjust decision points.

4. Operation Assessment Methods

a. **Contextual Assessments.** This method capitalizes on the decentralized nature of COIN operations to build assessment from the bottom up. Commanders at each echelon determine what is important to help them describe progress toward achieving objectives and attaining end states through a reporting period (typically a month or a quarter of a year). This obviates the need for the kind of centralized metrics that generally do not account for differences between tactical and operational aspects of OEs within the AORs.

(1) This process benefits from clear and well-defined strategic end state conditions. However, it can also be effective when end state conditions are unclear or shifting. Because commanders can almost always assess progress toward local objectives, this process will always produce a baseline of contextual, relevant, and informed information to support commanders' decisions.

(2) This narrative reporting process begins at the battalion level (or equivalent), the first level at which a staff exists. Each staff and commander gather all information they consider relevant for assessment, typically relying on CCIRs and existing operations and information and intelligence. At higher levels, staffs will begin to incorporate other information like interagency reporting. Subordinate units write their assessments, which are then aggregated into a single document and passed up the chain of command to the joint force staff level. At each level, the staff and commander provide an assessment summary and a commander's personal assessment, while retaining all of the quantitative and qualitative detail in the reports. This allows senior commanders to either read summaries of subordinate assessments or to immediately obtain contextual detail as needed.

(3) Contextual assessment leverages all types of information, including both qualitative information like HUMINT reports and quantitative information like the number of armored vehicles available to HN combat forces. The type of information used is less relevant than the way the information is presented: assessment narratives should place all data—qualitative and quantitative—in understandable local context.

(4) Once all reports have been aggregated, the joint force staff writes its periodic or event-driven assessment and submits it to the commander for review. This commander-driven assessment process is completed with the inclusion of the JFC's personal assessment, which is substantiated by layers of contextual reporting and assessment from the bottom up.

(5) One of the primary benefits of contextual assessment is that it is transparent. All sources should be cited with a simple reference to a primary source document or clearly identified as subjective analysis or opinion. Once aggregated, the contextual assessment will contain a wide array of transparent and cited information.

(6) Because contextual assessments are presented as narratives, they necessarily contain a good deal of subjective interpretation of inclusive data. This weakness should be sufficiently mitigated if included data are correctly cited. This process is generally less useful for events-driven assessment and more useful for periodic assessment.

b. Stage-Based Assessment Plans. A stage-based assessment plan uses sets of basic criteria to establish a common framework, with an emphasis on identifying key issues and potential means of addressing them, along with risk to the operation or campaign if they are not addressed. A stage-based assessment plan may use rating scales to describe the range of possible conditions that an LOO or LOE may produce.

(1) The rating scale should describe the range of possible conditions using no more than two relevant factors and should be articulated in a clear and concise manner. The stages should be developed in conjunction with the plan, and preferably, by the planners. The stages should describe high-level desired conditions rather than attempting to capture every nuance of every area of operations and be broad enough to represent change in conditions on time scales relevant to the operation or campaign.

(2) The results of the LOO/LOE end state assessment are then organized to answer the commander's questions. The stage-based approach allows the staff to focus attention on a narrowly selected list of information and intelligence requirements, and incorporate subordinate commanders' assessments into their conclusions.

(3) This allows the staff to graphically display past end state assessments, evaluation of current conditions, forecasted outcomes, desired end state conditions, risks (depicted by the gaps between the forecasted outcomes), and opportunities. These techniques are well suited to COIN because they display progress in a nonlinear way, and they allow the staff to graphically depict the interrelated nature of COIN objectives.

(4) To execute the stage-based assessments method, the staff requires more training than other methods. Depending on the echelon, this method may not be well suited for quick-turn assessments or frequent assessments. However, it does simplify the collection of information and intelligence requirements as key indicators and allows the staff to maintain a manageable list of information and intelligence requirements.

For more discussion on assessment, refer to JP 5-0, Joint Planning.

Intentionally Blank

CHAPTER VII COUNTERINSURGENCY OPERATIONS

“Campaigns are joint in nature—functional and Service components of the joint force conduct supported, subordinate, and supporting operations, not independent campaigns.”

Joint Publication 3-0, Joint Operations

SECTION A. EXECUTION

1. General

a. **The Nature of COIN Operations.** COIN operations require synchronized application of military, paramilitary, diplomatic, political, economic, law enforcement, psychological, and civic actions. The political issues at stake are often rooted in culture, ideology, societal tensions, and injustice. As such, they defy nonviolent solutions available through the ordinary course of governance. Joint forces can compel obedience and secure areas; however, they cannot by themselves achieve the political settlement needed to resolve the situation. Effective approaches to COIN include civilian agencies, US military forces, and multinational forces. COIN supports local institutions and their ability to enable good governance. These efforts purposefully attack the root causes of the insurgency rather than just its fighters and comprehensively address the associated core grievances. HN leaders should be purposefully involved in this effort and ultimately should take lead responsibility for it.

b. **Executing COIN.** There are myriad ways to achieve success in COIN. Neither discrete nor exclusive, various aspects may be combined, depending on the environment and available resources, to achieve objectives. It is incumbent upon the commander to adapt the approach to the demands of the local environment.

c. **General Patterns.** Though COIN is a counter effort, it does not concede the initiative. Insurgents and counterinsurgents constantly struggle toward their individual end states, both vying to win popular support, while the insurgents often try to force population’s acquiescence. Initial COIN normally requires the joint force to create a secure environment for the population. Ideally, HN forces hold cleared areas; however, insurgents often will not hold on to terrain as a static operation. They use mobility to strike at will and maintain the offensive. Therefore, the method of clearing and holding terrain might not be an effective use of resources and could tie down friendly forces limiting mobility and surrendering the initiative. As the HNSFs’ capabilities are further strengthened, the joint force may shift toward combined action and limited support. As HN forces assume internal and external security requirements, US forces can redeploy to support bases, reduce force strength, and eventually withdraw. SOF and conventional forces continue to provide support as needed to achieve IDAD objectives.

2. Support the Counterinsurgency Narrative

Operations/activities that fail to incorporate the COIN narrative will do greater harm more quickly than almost any deliberate action. Operations appropriately aligned with a narrative are strengthened through sense of purpose, unity of effort, and the ability to gain and maintain initiative against insurgents. The COIN narrative is most effective when recognized and respected across the COIN force and emboldened by everything counterinsurgents say and do.

3. Distributed Operations

COIN operations often require units, sometimes widely distributed and beyond mutually supporting range of each other, to conduct nonlinear activities/operations often in small, noncontiguous operational areas within the joint operations area. These distributed operations allow counterinsurgents to respond to all forms of insurgent activities, often simultaneously, and across a large area. The JFC should consider options whereby joint capabilities can be pushed to lower levels and placed under the control or in support of units that can use them effectively. Thus, commanders should allow subordinates access to, and control of, the resources needed to produce timely intelligence, conduct effective tactical operations, and execute information-related activities within their operational area.

4. Command and Control

a. C2 encompasses the exercise of authority and direction by a commander over assigned and attached forces to accomplish the mission. The commander provides operational vision, guidance, and direction. The C2 function encompasses a number of tasks, articulated in JP 3-0, *Joint Operations*, including the following tasks necessary for COIN operations:

- (1) Prepare and, when required, modify plans, orders, and guidance.
- (2) Command subordinate forces and establish appropriate command authorities among subordinate commanders.
- (3) Assign tasks and operational areas as needed.
- (4) Prioritize and allocate resources.
- (5) Communicate and maintain the status of information.
- (6) Assess progress toward accomplishing tasks, creating effects, and achieving objectives.
- (7) Coordinate, synchronize, and when appropriate, integrate joint operations with the operations and activities of HN and interorganizational partners.

b. **Command** includes both the authority and responsibility to effectively use available resources to accomplish assigned missions. Command is the art of motivating and directing people and organizations to accomplish missions. The C2 function supports an efficient decision-making process. Enabled by timely ISR, the objective is to provide the ability to make decisions and execute those decisions more rapidly and effectively than the adversary. This allows the commander more control over the timing and tempo of operations.

c. **Control is inherent in command.** To control is to manage and direct forces and functions consistent with a commander's command authority. Control of forces and functions helps commanders and staffs compute requirements, allocate means, and integrate efforts. Control is necessary to measure, report, and correct performance. Control permits the commander to acquire and apply means to support the mission and develop specific instructions from general guidance. Control provides the means for commanders to maintain freedom of action, delegate authority, direct operations from any location, and integrate and synchronize actions throughout the operational area.

For more discussion on C2, refer to JP 3-0, Joint Operations.

5. Rules of Engagement

ROE are directives issued by competent military authority that delineate the circumstances and limitations under which US forces will initiate and/or continue combat engagement with other forces encountered. Often these directives are specific to the operation. The goal in formulating ROE is to ensure they allow maximum flexibility for mission accomplishment while providing clear, unambiguous guidance to the forces affected. Standing rules of engagement (SROE) are fundamentally permissive in that a commander may use any lawful weapon or tactic available for mission accomplishment unless specifically restricted. The use of Service-approved, unit issued, nonlethal weapons is authorized and it is incumbent upon subordinate commanders to request supplemental measures if existing guidance is not sufficient. When working with a multinational force in COIN operations, commanders should coordinate the ROE thoroughly. All ROE should comply with the law of war. ROE in COIN are dynamic. Commanders should regularly review ROE for their effectiveness and continued compliance with the law of war. Training counterinsurgents in ROE should be reinforced regularly.

For additional information on ROE, see CJCSI 3121.01, (U) Standing Rules of Engagement/Standing Rules for the Use of Force for US Forces, and the Department of Defense Law of War Manual.

Refer to Chapter III, "Counterinsurgency," for additional discussion regarding ROE.

6. Operational Methods for Counterinsurgency

There are several options to consider when conducting COIN operations: generational approach; network engagement; shape, clear, hold, build, and transition (SCHBT); identify, separate, influence, and renunciation (ISIR); limited support/light footprint; partnering; and combined action. Each option offers a different but complementary avenue

and must be weighed against the OE. Each option can be used individually or in conjunction with the others. Negotiation and mediation and counterinsurgency operations are other methods to counter an insurgency.

7. Generational Approach

A generational approach includes activities that interact with segments of a population and seeks to influence the HN to educate and empower relevant HN population groups to participate in legal methods of political discourse and dissent. Generational approach activities are also a response to the common goal of many insurgent groups to attract youths to its ranks. A generational approach provides alternatives for youth to join and support the insurgency. It also empowers youth to protest in nonviolent manners and participate in development and decision making in their communities. This robs the insurgency of a disillusioned population from which to recruit. If it is assumed most insurgencies last for years, then it becomes important not only to influence the present-day leaders but also for the HN to form and mold the next generation of leaders to become peaceful participants in the existing form of government. A note of caution associated with a generational engagement: the population or youth groups may demonstrate and protest the very government the counterinsurgent hoped they would support. However, this might not be a failure, but rather a success. As is expected in functional societies, mass mobilizations and protests are preferred reactions to government failures instead of violent resistance or coup attempts. To ensure youth don't become future insurgent fighters, it is important to create channels for youth leaders to interact with their elders and power brokers in their own communities.

a. Many insurgencies are a generational affair for families, and children are taught at a young age to fight for the insurgency cause. This creates problems when the conflict ends, as many of the fighters only know war and have few, if any, skills to make a living making DDR more difficult.

b. A generational approach seeks to influence segments of a population to understand the benefit of participating in peaceful means to address their core grievances. Getting youths to understand the legal means they have to address root causes of conflict is a critical tool for reducing violence. If commanders and staffs believe insurgencies may occur over extended periods, then some efforts should be made to interact with this next generation of leaders who can establish a lasting peace. Interaction with the intellectual elites of the country should also be a consideration. They may still be residing in the country of conflict or in another country that has significant influence over the insurgent cause.

c. Commanders planning to use a generational approach should identify relevant target audiences within the population through JIPOE. Plans and methods for conducting discourse can vary, depending on the OE and the culture. This method is used in conjunction with direct methods as part of a comprehensive approach to combating insurgent forces. Counterinsurgents can make progress in defeating insurgent forces, but if they neglect the younger generation of the population they may lose the war. Continued and prolonged efforts should be made to convey the idea that counterinsurgents and the HN government are seen as positive influences. The population should identify with and

trust their government. Counterinsurgent efforts are coordinated and tracked through continued assessments to ensure success.

For additional information, see Field Manual (FM) 3-24/Marine Corps Warfighting Publication (MCWP) 3-33.5, Insurgencies and Countering Insurgencies.

d. Counterinsurgents can interact with and influence young factions of the population by implementing youth programs and participating in local council meetings that should include representatives from different generations of the population.

8. Network Engagement Activities

Network engagement is the interactions with friendly, neutral, and threat networks, conducted continuously and simultaneously at the tactical, operational, and strategic levels, to help achieve the commander's objectives. Network engagement is an approach that can be applied during all military operations and is applicable to both traditional warfare and IW. However, network engagement is particularly important in COIN as those operations are intertwined with friendly, neutral, and threat networks. To effectively counter insurgent, terrorist, and other threat networks, the joint force should partner with friendly networks and conduct network engagement with neutral networks through the building of mutual trust and cooperation. Conducting network engagement with neutral actors or networks can help cut off potential support for an insurgency. Unified action provides the opportunity for the JFC to create powerful friendly networks with far-reaching capabilities and to conduct network engagement with neutral networks. This enables the JFC to either solicit their assistance or prevent them from supporting an insurgent group and the ability to respond with pressure at multiple points of the insurgent or other threat network. The provision of HA is independent and neutral and must not be exploited by the warring parties. These integrated and combined activities are intended to establish conditions within the OE that align with the JFC's desired end state.

a. Network engagement consists of three components: partnering with friendly networks, engaging neutral networks, and countering threat networks (CTN) to assist in attaining the commander's desired end state. Network engagement is not a standalone process conducted separate from normal staff processes but should be fully integrated in operational design, JIPOE, the JPP, joint targeting operation execution, and joint assessments. Network engagement utilizes actions against nodes (person, place, or physical object) within a particular network.

b. Individuals may be associated with numerous networks due to their unique identities. Examples of these types of identities include location of birth, family, religion, social groups, organizations, or a host of various characteristics that define an individual. Therefore, it is not uncommon for an individual to be associated with more than one type of network (friendly, neutral, or threat). Individual identities provide the basis for the relationship between friendly, neutral, and threat networks to exist. It is this interrelationship that makes categorizing networks a challenge since many will not fit neatly into only one category. Classifying a network friendly or neutral when in fact it is a threat may provide the network with too much freedom or access. Likewise, labeling a

friendly or neutral network as a threat may cause actions to be taken against that network that can have unforeseen consequences. Prior to classifying a network friendly, neutral, or a threat, allow their position to be determined. While it may be possible to determine the position of specific elements of a network, this may not be representative of the network's position as a whole.

c. Interactions with networks or key members of a network can take many forms. Examples of actions that can create nonlethal effects can include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Electronic warfare (EW).
- (2) Cyberspace operations.
- (3) MISO.
- (4) HUMINT.
- (5) PA.
- (6) CMO.
- (7) MILDEC.
- (8) CTF.
- (9) Key leader engagements.
- (10) Nonlethal weapons employment.

For additional doctrine regarding network engagement, see JP 3-25, Countering Threat Networks, and ATP 5-0.6, Network Engagement.

9. Shape, Clear, Hold, Build, and Transition

A SCHBT operation is executed in a specific, high-priority area experiencing overt insurgent operations. It has the following objectives: create a secure physical and psychological environment, establish firm government control of the geographic area, and gain the populace's support. Popular support can be measured in terms of local participation in HN programs and political systems to counter the insurgency and whether people give counterinsurgents usable information about insurgent locations and activities.

a. Shape

(1) Shaping missions, tasks, and actions within COIN are those that dissuade or deter the insurgents, assure the HN populace, and set conditions for the continued operations. Shaping is conducted by capabilities that produce lethal and nonlethal effects. For example, an insurgency in its infancy can be shaped by SC or FID not involving combat. And, in a more mature insurgency, heavy use of information-related activities can shape the perceptions of friendly, neutral, or threat actors or groups. US forces do not

prepare for or conduct shaping in isolation. All involved partners are necessary to shape the area, the population, and the insurgency for future operations. Shaping activities should be executed persistently and consistently throughout all phases with the intent to enhance the legitimacy of the HN, reinforce multinational cooperation, shape the perceptions of the populace, influence the behavior of relevant actors, develop HN military capabilities, improve information exchange and intelligence sharing, and mitigate conditions that could lead to a crisis or escalation of current insurgent activities.

(2) Commanders choose where to execute shaping missions, tasks, and actions based on a HN's ability to impact the root causes of the insurgency, alter or eliminate the conditions that allow the insurgency to exist in that area, or isolate the insurgents from the population. During shaping preparation, commanders and staffs execute information collection on the components of an insurgency. A tool such as a census in towns or cities using biometrics data collection devices is an effective tool to account for the general populace. As part of the census, additional data, to include the specific root cause or causes of insurgency in the particular area; the expectations of the HN population; and the capability of HN institutions such as government, security, and rule of law, may be collected. Commanders and staffs may then conduct disruption operations to impact the insurgency's ability to influence an OE. COIN forces may conduct deception operations while preparing for follow-on SCHBT framework operations to force the insurgency to alter current operations.

(3) There are four key target audiences during the shape stage: the population, the insurgents, the COIN force, and regional and international audiences.

b. **Clear.** For COIN, clear is a task that requires the commander to remove guerrilla forces and eliminate organized resistance in an assigned area. The force does this by destroying, capturing, or forcing the withdrawal of guerrilla combatants. This task is most effectively initiated by a clear-in zone or cordon-and-search operation. The purpose is to disrupt insurgent forces and force a reaction by major insurgent elements in the area. Commanders employ a combination of offensive small-unit activities. These may include area saturation patrolling that enables the force to defeat insurgents in the area, interdiction ambushes, and targeted raids. COIN forces must take great care in the clear stage to comply with the law of war to avoid destruction or disruption of civilian homes and businesses. Collateral damage or driving people out of their homes and business to establish military headquarters in preparation for the hold stage, even when accompanied by compensation, can have negative, second- and third-order effects on the civilian population.

(1) **Initial Effort.** Clear is an offensive activity that is only the beginning, not the end state. Eliminating insurgent forces does not remove the entrenched insurgent infrastructure. While their infrastructure exists, insurgents continue to recruit among the population, attempt to undermine the HN government, and try to coerce the populace through intimidation and violence. After insurgent forces have been eliminated, removing the insurgent infrastructure begins. This should be done so as to minimize the impact on the local populace. Rooting out such infrastructure is essentially a police action that relies heavily on military and intelligence forces until HN police, courts, and legal processes can assume responsibility for law enforcement within the cleared area.

(2) **Isolation and Pursuit.** If insurgent forces are not eliminated but instead are expelled or have broken into smaller groups, they should be prevented from reentering the area or reestablishing an organizational structure inside the area. Once counterinsurgents have established their support bases, security elements cannot remain static. They should be mobile and establish a constant presence throughout the area. Offensive and stability tasks are continued to maintain gains and set the conditions for future activities. These include isolating the area to cut off external support and to kill or capture escaping insurgents; conducting periodic patrols to identify, disrupt, eliminate, or expel insurgents; and employing security forces and government representatives throughout the area to secure the populace and facilitate follow-on stages of development.

(3) **Information.** Relevant information is critical to operations to clear an area consider two key target audiences: the local populace and the insurgents. The message to the populace focuses on gaining and maintaining their overt support for COIN. This command theme is that the continuous security provided by US and HN forces is enough to protect the people from insurgent reprisals for their cooperation. Conversely, the populace should understand that actively supporting the insurgency will prolong combat operations, creating a risk to themselves and their neighbors. The command message to the insurgents focuses on convincing them that they cannot win and that the most constructive alternatives are to surrender or cease their activities.

c. **Hold.** Establishment of security forces in bases among the population furthers the continued disruption, identification, and elimination of the local insurgent leadership and infrastructure. The success or failure of the effort depends, first, on effectively and continuously securing the populace and, second, on effectively reestablishing a HN government presence at the local level. Measured offensive activities continue against insurgents as opportunities arise, but the main effort is focused on the population.

(1) **Purpose of Hold Activities.** Hold activities are designed to:

- (a) Continuously secure the people and separate them from the insurgents.
- (b) Establish a firm and persistent government presence and control over the area; conduct stability tasks and provide support to the populace.
- (c) Recruit, organize, equip, and train local security forces.
- (d) Establish a government political apparatus to replace the insurgent apparatus.
- (e) Develop a dependable network of sources by authorized intelligence agents.

(2) **Execution.** Major actions occurring during this stage include:

- (a) Designating and allocating area-oriented counterinsurgent forces to continue offensive activities. Other forces that participated in clearing actions are released or assigned to other tasks.

(b) A thorough population screening to identify and eliminate remaining insurgents and to identify any lingering insurgent support structures.

(c) In coordination with USAID or other USG departments and agencies, conducting to determine available resources and the populace's needs. Local leaders should be involved.

(d) Working with local paramilitary security forces to seek their cooperation and compliance with the rule of law, along with inclusion in the HN security structure. From the outset, counterinsurgents should consider implications for DDR to avoid arming a group that may return to the insurgency if counterinsurgent support ends without a viable alternative for the group.

d. **Build.** The purpose of the build phase is to simultaneously restore services, provide support to infrastructure and economic development, restore essential services, restore civil control, and build security force and law enforcement capability and capacity of the HN. Rebuilding infrastructure requires the utilization of stability activities and the identification of criteria to ensure HN institutions are prepared to assume primary responsibility for governance and security. National and international development agencies are primarily responsible for rebuilding infrastructure and key facilities, whereas the military will focus on the rebuilding of security force capacity. This is not to say that the military does not also assist in restoring essential services and providing support to economic and infrastructure development. Activities that address core grievances and provide an overt and direct benefit for the community are key initial priorities. Accomplishing these tasks can begin the process of establishing HN government legitimacy. Continued progress in building support for the HN government requires specified tasks within stability activities, starting with protecting the local populace. People who do not believe they are secure from both government and insurgent intimidation, coercion, and reprisals will not risk overtly supporting COIN. During the build phase, information-related activities should focus on two key audiences: the local populace and the COIN force. The message to the populace focuses on gaining and maintaining their overt support for COIN. This command theme is that the continuous security provided by US and HN forces provides an environment free of intimidation, violence, and coercion. The message should stress that US forces are repairing damaged infrastructure caused by the conflict and are in their country at the invitation of the government to help the populace.

For more information about stability activities, see JP 3-07, Stability.

e. Transition

(1) Transition is the process by which commanders and staff verify the HN institutions are prepared to assume primary responsibility for governance and security, and the method by which to transfer those responsibilities to the HN (see Figure VII-1). Effective transition requires commanders incorporate planning and execution of transition tasks as part of the SCHBT framework.

(2) Transition of responsibility for a function to the HN occurs when the HN is capable of assuming responsibility. Therefore, transition is not a onetime event. Transition is an ongoing process comprised of multiple transitions to HN agencies at different times during a SCHBT operation. It is a deliberative and orderly course of development and transfer of responsibility. It is a continual process in which the HN assumes responsibility incrementally as prepared.

(3) To facilitate transition within the SCHBT framework, it is advisable to establish an area coordination center (ACC). Diplomatic and governmental leaders should administer an ACC with the objective of turning over decision-making and coordination authority to the HN at the earliest opportunity. To be truly effective, DOS representatives (including USAID personnel) should lead an ACC. In the absence of DOS personnel, the commander assigned an operational area should initiate and manage the ACC until a government representative can take control. An ACC controls, manages, and coordinates all transition operations. Members of the ACC should include representatives of all multinational forces and HN agencies (military, police, intelligence, political, and civil administration) operating at the regional and local level. As an ACC coordinates all efforts that affect the ability to transition to HN control, the ACC is responsible for generating HN capability beyond just the security realm. An ACC should also coordinate the allocation of material and personnel resources, methods of policy implementation, and evaluation of intelligence in the area within which it is organized.

(4) Commanders and staff should understand and communicate as appropriate that, as changes occur within the OE, and as transitions occur, COIN force tasks will change. For example, when COIN forces transition from eliminating the combatants in an area to creating an environment for HN control, their mix of offensive, defensive, and stability tasks will change, as depicted in Figure VII-1. As insurgent capacity decreases and counterinsurgent capabilities increase, several transitions take place. This is in addition to the final transition to the HN lead.

10. Identify, Separate, Influence, and Renunciation

This operational approach combines several activities that affect relevant population groups. ISIR is a proactive, indirect method of countering an insurgency and works well in concert with other operational approaches. This method works best by, with, and through the HN; however, in cases of a fledgling or poorly trained HNSF, it might be required to be conducted by US forces. Its purpose is to identify and separate the insurgents from the population, then influence insurgents to renounce violence, either as individuals or as an insurgent group. By identifying who is an insurgent and who is not, and then applying resources to separate insurgents from the population, the counterinsurgent can make the insurgency feel isolated. Insurgents may then believe their causes for conflict are not supported by the population. Once the insurgent leaders and members feel isolated from the population, influence can be applied to cause the insurgents to defect, surrender, and renounce violence. Commanders should conduct a detailed assessment of the insurgent and population networks before executing the ISIR method. This assessment guides the application of individual means to disassemble the insurgent network. COIN forces and




Figure VII-1. Transition Examples

other actors may enter the process at many different stages; therefore, assessment is a continuous process used to guide decision making throughout operations.

a. **Identify.** Identity activities help identify insurgents, insurgent supporters, and terrorists. I2 also can assist in developing an understanding of friendly and neutral persons operating in the operational area.

For more information on I2, refer to Chapter IV, “The Operational Environment,” subparagraph 3.h.

b. Separate

(1) History demonstrates that the COIN force should separate the insurgents from the population. Counterinsurgents do this by physically and psychologically separating the two parties.

(a) Physical separation can be done using physical barriers such as concrete walls, fences, or other means. Physical barriers have been used in places such as Northern Ireland, Israel, and Iraq. Historically, relocation of vulnerable populations to safe zones has had some success, so long as the relocation is voluntary. However, unless for obvious risks to their own security, the populace should retain their freedom of movement and the use of physical barriers should not rise to the level of confinement. If relocation is required for security reasons, humanitarian considerations must be taken into account and addressed, and care should be taken to ensure the physical separation does not contribute to sectarian division.

(b) Psychological separation can be accomplished by the use of the COIN narrative, information-related activities, and social media. Aspects of EW can be effective by psychologically separating the insurgent if they use radio, television, or computers to recruit or win over the neutral population.

(2) Populace and resources control (PRC) can be an effective way of separating insurgents from the populace, and it could also help in identifying insurgents. PRC consists of two distinct, yet linked, components: populace control and resources control. When separating the two parties, populace control is the most effective component. Populace control provides security to people, mobilizes human resources, denies personnel to the enemy, and detects and reduces the effectiveness of enemy agents. These controls are normally a responsibility of HN civilian governments. US forces may implement PRC when HN civilian authorities or agencies are unable or unwilling to. PRC conducted as part of COIN operations requires extensive planning and coordination among various military and civilian organizations.

c. Influence

(1) The objective of influence is to get either individual insurgents or the insurgent organization to renounce violence as a means of addressing their core grievances. This could lead to insurgents surrendering and then entering the DDR process. The overwhelming application of capabilities to influence the insurgents can negate their willingness to fight. While it is unlikely counterinsurgents will change insurgents’ political beliefs, it is possible to change their behavior. Beliefs in general can be influenced. While deeply held world views and political positions are resilient to outside influence, beliefs about the current state of affairs and prospects for the future are malleable. This is how influence most often changes behavior: by influencing the perceptions of the target audience in such a way that they rationally choose a new COA.

(2) Influence consists of the continuous application of military pressure, by raids, ambushes, and counterinsurgency activities. This continuous application of pressure can influence insurgents to believe the cause is unlikely to succeed in spite of their efforts. Or, for experienced insurgents whom may have been fighting for years, influence them to leave the insurgency.

(3) CCS process. The JFC uses the CCS for coordinating and synchronizing themes, messages, images, operations, and actions to support USG strategic objectives and ensure the integrity and consistency of themes and messages to the lowest tactical level through the integration and synchronization of all relevant communication activities.

(4) The enticement of an amnesty program influences members of the insurgency to renounce violence and/or surrender. The essential part of an amnesty program is that insurgents believe they will be treated well and protected. Thus, counterinsurgents should have detailed information-related activities to inform the insurgents about the program and encourage them to turn themselves in. Pragmatism should be the first consideration of amnesty programs, not ideology or vendetta. Counterinsurgents should also have methods to protect the former insurgents. Incentives for disaffected insurgents or their supporters are important, especially the use of modest monetary rewards.

(5) An element of PRC can also help influence the insurgency. Resources control regulates the movement or consumption of materiel resources, mobilizes materiel resources, and denies materiel to the enemy. Resources control measures include licensing, regulations or guidelines, checkpoints (e.g., roadblocks), ration controls, amnesty programs, and inspection of facilities. By using resource controls, the counterinsurgent can interdict the movement of weapons, supplies, or leaders. Interdicting these may cause the insurgents to believe they are isolated and have little to no chance of winning an armed conflict against the government.

(6) Turning former insurgents against their previous comrades can provide an extreme amount of influence against former insurgent colleagues and leaders to leave the insurgency. Former insurgents who have defected or surrendered can provide vital information and even become valuable allies and combatants. However, information provided by a former insurgent should be evaluated and validated to prevent misinformation and deception. Incentives and a sense of fair treatment by counterinsurgents are vital to effective defector programs, which are also dependent on effective information operations.

d. Renunciation

(1) Insurgent renunciation of violence is the objective of ISIR, but not its end state. ISIR should be continued until the insurgency ends. Renunciation has two components that should be taken into consideration: individual insurgents and insurgent organizations. When the ISIR produces effects, the DDR process begins.

(2) When individual insurgents renounce violence, they could end up in three statuses. They might stay in the insurgency and move from the military wing, to the

**CHIEU HOI PROGRAM, THE ROOTS OF IDENTIFY, SEPARATE,
INFLUENCE, AND RENUNCIATION**

One of the aspects of the CORDS [Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support] program was the Chieu Hoi (Open Arms) program that, by the use of targeted psychological operations, sought to induce Viet Cong (VC) defections on a large scale. One of the key difficulties in getting the program off the ground was convincing the Government of Vietnam (GVN) that it made sense to offer your enemy amnesty and rehabilitation merely for the asking. One of the factors influential in persuading the GVN to adopt the program was the requirement that each defector must cooperate voluntarily in supplying all useful information available to him about the VC and undergo a period of indoctrination during which the defectors attitudes and political understanding were to be revised in the appropriate direction.

Chieu Hoi had some problems in its initial years. In 1964, four thousand would be defectors who volunteered for the program in mass slipped through the government fingers for lack of preparation and understanding of the program. In time the program was improved and in 1969 forty-seven thousand VC personnel voluntarily went over to the government side. In 1970, the figure was thirty-two thousand. In all, the program induced the defections of over 194,000 enemy personnel.

**SOURCE: Douglas Blaufarb
*The Counterinsurgency Era: US Doctrine and Performance, 1977***

auxiliary, or underground in a noncombatant role. While this result is not preferred, it does, after a while, reduce the fighting capability and capacity of the insurgency and may eventually lead to a transition from violence to political resistance. Other outcomes could be the defection or surrender of insurgent personnel. Colombia has had great success with influencing insurgents to defect or surrender, offering enticements as described in the influence section. It is estimated that more than 54,000 members of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia and the United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia have defected and renounced violence since the government of Colombia enacted programs to influence renunciation of violence, defection, and surrender in 2003. Insurgents are informed of their options through various information-related activities. Insurgents may be prone to defect when conflict has been prolonged, the broad population is weary of conflict, or if the insurgents have an uneven sense of purpose or drive. Defector knowledge of how the insurgents are led, organized, and operate can prove invaluable. This can include personality profiles of insurgent leaders, current communication procedures, plans, and TTP. This information can be part of intelligence and put back into the ISIR model to adjust and enhance information-related activities against the remaining insurgents.

11. Limited Support/Light Footprint

COIN operations do not always require large combat formations. In many cases, US support is limited, focused on missions like advising security forces and providing fire support or sustainment. The US support to the Philippines and US COIN support to El

Salvador in the 1980s are examples of such limited support. The limited approach focuses on building HN capability and capacity. Under this approach, HNSF are expected to conduct combat operations, including any clearing and holding missions.

12. Combined Action

Combined action is a technique that involves joining US and HN ground troops in a single organization, usually a platoon or company, to conduct COIN operations. This technique is appropriate in environments where large insurgent forces do not exist or where insurgents lack resources and freedom of maneuver. Combined action normally involves joining a US rifle squad or platoon with a HN platoon or company, respectively. Commanders use this approach to hold and build while providing a persistent counterinsurgent presence among the populace. This approach attempts to first achieve security and stability in a local area, followed by offensive operations against insurgent forces now denied access or support. Combined-action units are not equipped for offensive operations themselves and rely on more robust combat units to perform this task. Combined-action units can also establish mutual support among villages to secure a wider area.

a. **Security Situation.** A combined-action program can work only in areas with limited insurgent activity. The technique should not be used to isolate or expel a well-established and supported insurgent force. Combined action is most effective after an area has been cleared of armed insurgents.

b. **Influencing Factors.** The following geographic and demographic factors can also influence the likelihood of success:

(1) Towns relatively isolated from other population centers are simpler to secure continuously.

(2) Towns and villages with a limited number of roads passing through them are easier to secure than those with many routes in and out. All approaches should be guarded.

(3) Existing avenues of approach into a town should be observable from the town. Keeping these areas under observation facilitates interdiction of insurgents and control of population movements.

(4) The local populace should be small and constant. People should know one another and be able to easily identify outsiders. In towns or small cities where this is not the case, a census is the most effective tool to establish initial accountability for everyone.

(5) Combined-action units or LDFs should establish mutual support with forces operating in nearby towns. Quick reaction forces (ground maneuver or air assault), fires, CAS, and medical evacuation should be quickly available. Engineer and explosive ordnance disposal assets should also be available.

c. **Relationships.** Combined-action unit members should develop and build positive relationships with their associated HNSF and with the town leadership. By living among

the people, combined-action units serve an important purpose. They demonstrate the commitment and competence of counterinsurgents while sharing experiences and relationships with local people. These working relationships build trust and enhance the HN government's legitimacy within the proximate population. To build trust further, US members should ask HNSF for training and advice regarding local customs; culturally important terrain, landmarks, dates or institutions; and relevant cultural dynamics. The employment of low-collateral damage and nonlethal weapons, both of which are intended to minimize civilian casualties and limit collateral damage, may also aid in gaining the trust of the populace and international community.

d. **C2 Architecture.** Combined- action units are integrated into a regional scheme of mutually supporting security and influence; however, they should remain organic to their parent unit. Positioning reinforced squad-sized units among HN citizens creates a dispersal risk. Parent units can mitigate this risk with on call reserve and reaction forces along with mutual support from adjacent villages and towns.

e. **Integration.** Thoroughly integrating US and HN combined-action personnel supports the effective teamwork critical to the success of each team and the overall program. US members should be drawn from some of the parent unit's best personnel. Designating potential members before deployment facilitates the training and team building needed for combined-action unit success in theater. Preferably, team members should have had prior experience in the HN. Other desirable characteristics include: experience with the HN language, the ability to learn languages or support of reliable translators, and patience and tolerance when dealing with language and translation barriers.

13. Targeting

Targeting is the process of selecting and prioritizing targets and matching the appropriate response to them, considering operational requirements and capabilities. The targeting process considers all available capabilities to facilitate creating lethal and/or nonlethal effects that support the logical LOOs in a COIN operation or campaign plan. Targeting is conducted for all COIN operations. The targeting process can support information-related activities, CMO, and even meetings between commanders and HN leaders. Targeting also links intelligence, plans, and operations across all levels of command. Targeting encompasses many processes, all linked and logically guided by the joint targeting cycle, that continuously seek to analyze, identify, develop, validate, assess, and prioritize targets for engagement to achieve the commander's objectives and attain the end state.

a. **Purpose.** The purpose of targeting is to integrate and synchronize efforts. Targeting provides an iterative methodology for the development, planning, execution, and assessment in supporting objectives. Targeting in COIN is a unified action that involves participation from all appropriate elements.

b. **Focus.** The focus for COIN targeting is on nodes (people, places, and things) and the friendly, neutral, and threat networks. There are several different potential targets that can link objectives with effects in COIN. Effective targeting identifies the targeting options to create effects that support achievement of the commander's objectives. Some

targets are best addressed with means that create lethal effects, while other targets are best engaged with different means. Having nonlethal weapons available during CMO, FID, and humanitarian operations when dealing with crowd control and individuals with unknown intent can be beneficial. Other options include information activities, negotiation and mediation, political programs, CTF, economic programs, social programs, and other noncombat methods. Creating nonlethal effects with intended reversibility in COIN will discourage, delay, and prevent hostile actions; limit escalation of violence; provide force options when lethal force is not preferred or authorized; enhance long-term force protection; and reduce collateral damage that will help decrease post-conflict costs of reconstruction.

c. **Targeting Cycle.** The joint targeting cycle is an iterative process that is not time constrained, and steps may occur concurrently, but it provides a helpful framework to describe the steps that should be satisfied to successfully conduct joint targeting. An effective, disciplined joint targeting cycle helps minimize undesired effects and reduces inefficient actions during COIN.

For more information on targeting, see JP 3-60, Joint Targeting.

14. Localized Security Activities

a. The primary focus of localized security activities is the development of community capacity to provide for its own security of the population. Localized security activities are conducted at the local level, designed to augment wider COIN operations to reduce insurgent influence and access within the community by assisting the populace to stand up against insurgents, and are an economy of force for HN forces. Localized security activities are a bottom-up COIN activity specific to each individual local community. Strategically located localized security areas may deny the insurgency access to necessary sustainment resources such as, but not limited to, food commodities, communications networks, natural resources for funding, and additional manpower from recruiting. As the number of localized security areas increase, the insurgents continue to lose access, allowing for the establishment and solidification of legitimate local governance. As these security areas connect, they simultaneously force the insurgents out and connect local informal governance structures to the HN government. The central actor in localized security activities are LDFs. The LDF consists of civilian militias or paramilitary forces capable of conducting defensive and limited offensive operations. The LDF operates either part-time or full-time depending on the security requirements. In addition to providing a limited military function, the LDF can also serve a police function if government police are not available. LDF members are individually vetted, trained, and armed members of a local population who work in tandem with government forces to ensure the safety of the public. Their capacity to contribute to the establishment of the rule of law is an essential factor to mission success.

b. The LDF can be augmented by multinational or HN forces living among the people. The USG participation in this effort includes vetting, training, and arming the LDF; maintaining visibility of LDF activities; building local relationships; and empowering their traditional local governance structures within the community. Arming and maintaining

LDFs must follow applicable Congressional funding authorities (see Appendix B, “Authorities in Counterinsurgency Operations”). US SOF are specifically trained to provide the training for LDFs. The risks of arming multiple LDFs without appropriate supervision and oversight may include creating another armed force that opposes the HN government, that attempts to settle ancient grievances against other communities, or preys upon the population they were created to protect. Given these risks, prior to the establishment of an LDF, the JFC and HN government should do everything within their power to ensure respect of the law of war (and other applicable legal frameworks) by the LDFs and refrain from providing any support that would encourage or assist the violations of the law of war or other relevant laws and standards. To the extent possible, LDF leadership and members should be vetted to enhance safety and security.

LOCAL DEFENSE FORCES

The establishment of a host nation local defense force (LDF) to provide security has been a mainstay in the histories of counterinsurgencies around the world. Between 1981 and 2007, governments in 88 countries established or supported more than 300 armed militias to provide security to local communities. Notable success by LDFs could be seen in Malaya, Thailand, Peru, Vietnam, Guatemala, Colombia, Iraq, and Afghanistan. During the Napoleonic wars and in modern times, the creation of LDFs were essential in providing local defense, during conflict or post conflict, when military forces departed the area.

One of the more successful examples of augmentation of an LDF was the Combined Action Program (CAP) in South Vietnam. Under the CAP, a squad of Marines would live in the local village to provide training to the LDF and to provide a government link for reinforcements or air support if needed. The permanent presence of the Marines in the village assured the community and LDF that they were not going to be abandoned. Another key factor of CAP is that government forces were present to prevent atrocities by LDF. Considerations for maintaining control of an LDF need to be taken before establishing a LDF. Even a small militia can become oppressive and commit abuses when it operates without proper oversight and controls. The authorities given to the LDF by the government needs to be clearly defined. Things such as a restricted operational area, the powers to arrest and detain, and use of force (lethal and nonlethal) and rules of engagement need to be trained and reinforced constantly, to prevent the LDF from going rogue. Colombia is a good example of a militia that went rogue. The United Self-Defense Force of Colombia was established to provide local self-defense against the National Liberation Army, and in that vein, it was successful. However, as the United Self-Defense Force of Colombia grew in power, it eventually contested the authority of the state, resulting in the need to defeat the United Self-Defense Force of Colombia in battle and dismantle the organization.

Various Sources

c. The LDFs will be numerically inferior and under armed relative to the insurgency. Therefore, the HN and JFC should devise a plan to provide LDF access to additional resources, as needed, and support, including access to a quick reaction force, fires, and medical, as required.

d. HN and JFC should consider creating an external mechanism to receive, process, and act upon complaints lodged against or abuses committed by the LDF. One way to keep control of the LDF is to control the resources they need to provide protection. Items such as fuel, ammunition, arms, and food can be restricted or taken away if the LDF does not adhere to the established authorities and roles that created it.

15. Fires and Joint Fire Support

COIN Fires Considerations. When conducting COIN operations, a commander may place additional constraints on fires, beyond what might be legally required, to avoid collateral damage that might bolster the local population's support for the insurgency, decrease its support of US involvement, or degrade the US population's support for the operation.

For additional discussion regarding fire support, refer to JP 3-09, Joint Fire Support.

16. Commander's Communication Synchronization

a. CCS is the JFC's process to coordinate and synchronize themes, messages, images, operations, and actions to with all instruments of national power in order to create, strengthen, or preserve conditions USG interests and objectives. CCS ensures the integrity and consistency of themes and messages to the lowest tactical level through the integration and synchronization of communication with operational activities. Figure VII-2 highlights key objectives of the CCS process to inform, educate, persuade, and influence and how their integration can be mapped. This figure is not an exhaustive list but does portray an example of how CCS should be integrated.

b. Synchronized communication focuses on understanding and communicating with key audiences to create, strengthen, or preserve support essential to mission success by mitigating misinformation and propaganda. The commander's approach to synchronizing communication emphasizes early planning, training, and guidance that enables decentralized, yet responsive action that reflects strategic guidance. Communication planners should consider both positive and negative influences on publics' behavior. However, positive influence is often more effective in helping to create desired, long-term effects; contributing to success across the LOEs; and engendering enduring support. Research should be prioritized to carefully consider how CCS efforts can best support operational objectives through information-related activities.




Figure VII-2. Inform, Educate, Persuade, and Influence Integration

SECTION B. SUPPORTING OPERATIONS AND ACTIVITIES

17. Civil-Military Operations and Teaming

a. Effective COIN requires the integration of HN and supporting nation civil and military efforts into a single holistic approach. This requires a concerted effort to ensure interagency partners have a common understanding of the challenge and each other’s roles and capabilities in addressing it. Combatant commanders (CCDRs), subordinate JFCs, their staffs, interagency partners, and others conducting COIN operations should understand civilian roles and relationships and plan for, deconflict, and enable unity of effort for activities.

b. The integration of the instruments of national power in COIN frequently exposes military forces to a wider range of civil-dimension skills and capabilities than those military forces typically train for or inherently possess. As a result, coordination and collaboration become more important as the JFC seeks to gain unity of effort.

c. Civil-military teams are temporary organizations of civilian and military personnel that are task-oriented to provide an optimal mix of capabilities and expertise to accomplish specific planning or assessment tasks or to conduct synchronized or integrated activities at the strategic, operational, or tactical level. Civil-military teams can either be co-located or come together for designated planning or implementation functions. They provide the JFC with a means to understand the benefits of competencies that are normally external to the military. They help integrate the knowledge, expertise, and unique capabilities of DOD and civilian agencies with multinational military forces and civilian elements of multinational partners to implement an integrated COIN strategy with their HN counterparts. Civil-military teams help the JFC understand the unique roles, responsibilities, parallel relationships, and objectives of other international and nongovernmental actors and organizations that may be present in the OE but over which neither the JFC nor the COM exercises authority.

d. **Civil-Military Mechanisms in the US.** Key civil-military integration mechanisms located outside of the GCC's AOR include the National Security Council; special missions established in Washington, DC, to provide policy guidance for a theater (e.g., the Iraq Policy and Operations Group and the Afghanistan Interagency Operations Group); and appointed leaders focused on a particular COIN operation.

For more information on national-level mechanisms, see JP 3-08, Interorganizational Cooperation.

e. **Civil-Military Integration Mechanisms in Theater.** GCCs are charged with coordinating US military policy and operations within an assigned AOR. Subordinate JTFs are assigned to conduct joint military operations within a designated operational area which may be one or more countries affected by an insurgency. The US country team, advance civilian team (ACT), JFC, executive steering committee, provincial authority, civil-military coordination board (CMCB), joint CMO task forces, joint interagency task forces, GATs, PRTs, and CMOCs are key civil-military integration mechanisms that are normally located inside the designated operational area. The more extensive the US participation is in a COIN operation and the more dispersed US forces are throughout a country, the greater the need for additional mechanisms to extend civilian oversight and assistance. Operating with a clear understanding of the guiding political aims, members of the military at all levels must be prepared to exercise judgment and act without the benefit of immediate civilian oversight and control and ultimately to reinforce HN credibility and legitimacy. At each subordinate political level of the HN government and military and civilian leaders should establish the necessary integration mechanisms. These mechanisms should include military and civilian representatives of the HN and other multinational members. Commanders should be aware of the activities of international organizations and NGOs in the theater. However, JFCs should be aware the international organizations and NGOs, some of which, such as the ICRC, have independent, impartial, and neutral statuses, are

not obligated to work as part of a USG or multinational force or to support the IDAD strategy.

(1) **Joint Interagency Coordination Group (JIACG).** JIACGs help CCDRs support COIN by facilitating unified action in support of plans, operations, contingencies, and initiatives. The primary role of the JIACG is to enhance interagency coordination. The JIACG is a fully integrated participant on the CCDR's staff with a daily focus on joint strategic planning. It provides a capability specifically organized to enhance situational awareness of interagency activities to prevent undesired consequences and uncoordinated activity. When activated, the JIACG will assist with the reception of the integration planning cell into the staff. The integration planning cell is an interagency team that brings operation-specific capabilities to a regional military command, either a GCC or an equivalent multinational headquarters. The purpose of the integration planning cell is to support civil-military communication and integration of the civilian and military planning to achieve unity of effort. JIACGs include representatives from other federal departments and agencies and state and local authorities, as well as liaison officers from other commands and DOD components. The JIACG provides the CCDR with the capability to collaborate at the operational level with other USG departments and agencies. Representatives and liaison officers are the subject matter experts for their respective agencies and commands. They provide the critical bridge between the CCDR and USG interagency partners; however, JIACGs can be called by different names in different CCMDs.

For additional information on JIACGs, see JP 3-08, Interorganizational Cooperation.

(2) **National-Level GATs.** A national-level GAT supports governance and development at the national level in an uncertain environment. GATs operate by combining civilian and military personnel for development and governance into one cohesive team. A representative from DOS is the team leader, and a military officer is normally the deputy commander. Personnel from appropriate USG departments and agencies make up the elements focused on governance and development where DOD personnel comprise the civil security focused staffs. However, when civilian agencies lack the capacity, DOD personnel, especially reservists with civilian skills, may be used to mitigate a shortfall. GATs vary in structure, size, and mission to suit their situation; however, all GATs facilitate the plan in a collapsed state setting or the IDAD strategy in COIN that directly supports an HN. GATs extend the reach, capability, and capacity of governance and facilitate reconstruction. While the GATs are primarily concerned with addressing national-level conditions, they also work on building and improving communication and linkages between the central government and regional/local agencies.

(3) **Subnational GATs.** PRTs and district support teams (DSTs) are examples of subnational civil-military teams which were formed to address unique aspects of COIN operations and campaigns in Iraq and/or Afghanistan. These teams were designed to improve stability in a given area by helping build the legitimacy and effectiveness of an HN local or provincial government in providing security to its citizens and delivering essential government services. PRTs vary in structure, size, and mission. PRTs extend the reach, capability, and capacity of governance and facilitate construction. While PRTs and

CIVIL OPERATIONS AND REVOLUTIONARY DEVELOPMENT IN VIETNAM

During the US actions in Vietnam, the US established the Civil Operations and Revolutionary Development Support (CORDS) program, which brought together elements of the military, United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Department of State (DOS), the United States Information Agency (USIA), and the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), among others, to “promote pacification of the countryside through rural development programs coordinated with military operations.” CORDS was a predecessor to the provincial reconstruction teams that operated in Afghanistan.

CORDS was established to address several critical needs, including: 1) the need to enhance coordination among the various agencies -- USAID, State [DOS], USIA, CIA, and the US military advisory units (as distinct from war fighting units) and 2) the importance of having a single, coordinated United States Government (USG) entity providing liaison/advisory assistance to the South Vietnamese government (GVN) from national down to the district level. Prior to the formation of CORDS, the several USG agencies each had representatives at the province level, and each considered its counterpart to be the GVN Province Chief. This clearly was not practical for ensuring appropriate relative priority for the differing support sought from the GVN for USG assisted activities.

CORDS included refugee resettlement, development of police forces, the Chieu Hoi program (Amnesty/ISIR [identify, separate, influence, renunciation]), Phoenix program (Viet Cong Infrastructure [VCI] neutralization) and Revolutionary Development Cadre (which dealt with restoring local elected government, medical treatment, local development projects, and farmer credit), all under a unified command structure. CORDS was fully coordinated with the GVN, who eventually assumed full responsibility for the program.

Many historians believe that CORDS was a great success. CORDS is credited in both the defeat of the VCI, and the political, economic, and military self-reliance of South Vietnam. Unfortunately, it was not designed to defend South Vietnam from a major offensive by North Vietnam without US air support.

**SOURCE: William Schoux
“The Vietnam CORDS Experience: A Model of
Successful Military Partnership?”
26 September 2005**

DSTs are primarily concerned with addressing local conditions, they also work on building and improving communication and linkages among the central government and regional and local agencies.

(4) **ACT.** An ACT may be formed to implement the USG strategic plan for reconstruction and stabilization through development and management of the interagency

implementation plan (IIP), under the leadership of the COM. The ACT stands up at the USG field headquarters, typically the embassy. When established, it is the integrating civilian counterpart of the JTF at the country level. The ACT is composed of a combination of USG personnel already in the country and other agency personnel deployed to the country from agency headquarters or elsewhere.

(5) **Executive Steering Group (ESG).** The COM and a JFC can jointly form an ESG. The ESG is composed of senior military representatives from the joint force, principals of the embassy (e.g., ambassador, deputy COM, political or political-military counselor), the HN, possibly NGOs, international organizations, private sector entities present in the joint operations area, and other organizations as appropriate. Lacking another similar forum, the ESG can provide high-level outlet for the exchange of information about operational policies, as well as for resolution of difficulties arising among the various organizations. The ESG plays a policy role and is charged with interpreting and coordinating operational area aspects of strategic policy. A commander at any echelon may establish an ESG to serve as a conduit through which to provide information and policy guidance to participating agencies. The ESG may be charged with formulating, coordinating, and promulgating local and theater policies required for the explanation, clarification, and implementation of US policies. The ESG should either be co-chaired by the JFC and COM or assigned outright to either individual, depending on the nature of the US mission and possibly based on the security situation.

(6) **Regional Authority.** Direction and coordination of PRTs are conducted by a national-level interagency steering committee, under the supervision of the COM and JFC (for US-led PRTs) or a multinational executive committee (for multinational force-led PRTs). This body will also conduct liaison with the HN national government to support PRT operations. Both embassy and joint force personnel staff the steering committee. Regional authorities may be established with regional commanders overseeing a number of PRTs to ensure coordination between provinces and with national-level objectives. The regional authority coordinates the deployment and operations of all US PRTs in the operational area, including ensuring PRTs have a long-term vision nested with either the campaign plan or the IDAD strategy, whichever is appropriate at the time. If an ACT has been established at the country level, a decision to deploy field advance civilian teams (FACTs) to subnational regions or provinces may follow. FACTs, which are an element of the ACT and are managed by its headquarters, are responsible for implementing plans pertaining to their particular area of geographical responsibility and for informing revisions of the overall USG strategic plan and IIP. They also coordinate planning with any US military entities operating in their geographical area, to achieve the objectives in the IIP. FACTs are primarily local, on-the-ground, operational entities, but their role in assessments, plan revisions, and subnational field-level planning is also important.

(7) **CMCB.** If established, a CMCB is the JFC's vehicle to coordinate CMO support. Membership is typically restricted to key representatives from the joint force staff sections. A senior member of the staff, such as the deputy commander or chief of staff, serves as chairperson of this board. If a CMOC has been established at the subordinate level, the CMOC director would be a key member of the board and may also serve as its chairperson. During COIN multinational operations, the commander should normally

include multinational partners on the board unless there are compelling reasons not to. The type of C2 structure and the level of staff integration in the joint force should drive the decision to establish a coordination board and determine its membership. Depending on the situation, the commander should include selected members from the US country team on the board.

(8) **Joint Civil-Military Operations Task Force (JCMOTF).** The JFC may establish a JCMOTF to improve CMO in support of COIN operations. The JCMOTF can provide the JFC a subordinate command to exercise necessary control and coordinating support when the size and scope of the COIN mission is beyond organic CMO capabilities. The JCMOTF should be functionally organized around an existing command structure with augmentation. The JFC designates the JCMOTF commander. A JCMOTF is composed of units from more than one Service and is formed to carry out CMO. Although the JCMOTF is not a CA organization, there may be a requirement for strong representation of CA. Because of their expertise in dealing with NGOs, international organizations, and USG interagency partners, they will greatly enhance the opportunity for success in COIN. By design, Army or Marine Corps CA assets can provide the base structure to create a JCMOTF. In rare instances, and depending on resource availability, a JCMOTF could be formed as a standing organization.

For more information, see JP 3-57, Civil-Military Operations.

(9) **USAID Office of Civilian-Military Cooperation (CMC).** The CMC enables civilian-military cooperation in development and security efforts consistent with national security objectives. The purpose of the office is to improve communication, cooperation, and collaboration between USAID and DOD on policy and the strategic and operational levels. US objectives are best achieved through a whole-of-government effort that harnesses and coordinates development, diplomacy, and defense efforts. USAID seeks to advance the development agenda by cultivating and maintaining a strong relationship with DOD. The CMC is a part of USAID's Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA). USAID senior and deputy development advisors have been placed in the geographic CCMDs and the DCHA/CMC hosts military representatives from each command. The DCHA/CMC is responsible for USAID's civilian-military cooperation policy. The CMC plays a role analogous to DOS's Bureau of Political Military Affairs with the alignment of planning efforts. The CMC authors strategic guidance on development and stabilization in coordination with DOD and other interagency partners. The country development cooperation strategy is USAID's primary, country-level, multi-year strategic plan. It describes a country's basic development challenges, outlines the strategic rationale for how challenges and opportunities will be addressed, and lays out a long-term development vision for the country. USAID requires its field missions to share its country development cooperation strategies during phase 1 of their development with the CCMDs and, in turn, CCMDs are encouraged to share theater campaign plans with USAID missions in their AORs. USAID missions are required to designate a mission civilian-military coordinator that functions as a first point of contact for DOD with USAID in missions where DOD needs to coordinate its HA and SC activities that may have a development objective. The USAID senior and deputy development advisors embedded at the CCMD can also assist in this regard.

For additional information regarding CMC, refer to JP 3-07, Stability.

18. Security Cooperation

SC involves all DOD interactions with foreign defense establishments to build defense relationships that promote specific US security interests, develop allied and friendly military capabilities for self-defense and multinational operations, and provide US forces with peacetime and contingency access to an HN. These activities help the US and HN gain credibility and help the HN build legitimacy. These efforts can help minimize the effects of or prevent insurgencies and thwart their regeneration. The key subsets of SC in support of COIN are DOD administered SA and SFA:

a. SA is a group of SC programs funded by DOS to be administered by DOD/Defense Security Cooperation Agency. SA encompasses efforts of civilian agencies as well as those of the military. SA is the provision of defense articles, military training, and other defense-related services by grant, loan, credit, or cash sales in furtherance of US national policies and objectives.

b. SFA consists of the DOD activities that contribute to unified action by the USG to support the development of the capacity and capability of foreign security forces and their supporting institutions. In the context of COIN, SFA encompasses joint force activities conducted within unified action to train, advise, assist, and equip the HNSF in support of that government's efforts to generate, employ, and sustain local, HN, or regional security forces and their supporting institutions. SFA may also include similar efforts in neighboring countries to assist that PN in denying external safe haven to the insurgency. This includes activities from ministry-level to tactical-level units of action, and the national security support base. HNSF can be comprised of civilians, SOF, and conventional forces and are often responsible for law enforcement, border security, and stability tasks. HNSF can be at the regional level, such as UN forces, and all levels of the HN from local to national. Many actors can participate in SFA, including joint, international, interagency, multinational, nongovernmental, and others. These efforts focus on the HN's efforts to increase its security forces' capability and capacity. JFCs should ensure trainers and advisors are well prepared and qualified for their particular mission for the HN military engagement to be successful. Developing HN tactical capabilities alone is inadequate; strategic and operational capabilities should be developed as well. HN organizations and units should reflect their own unique requirements, interests, and capabilities—they should not simply mirror existing external institutions. SFA includes organizing institutions and units, which can range from standing up a ministry to improving the organization of the smallest maneuver unit. Building capability and capacity in this area includes personnel, logistics, and intelligence and their support infrastructure. In time, the HNSF should establish the capacity to generate its own forces through recruiting, vetting, and induction of enlistees, as well as officer candidates; initial entry training for all personnel, to include basic warrior or police skills and advanced technical, tactical, and leadership training; and processes for continuing training and skills maintenance, promotion, noncommissioned officer training, and senior leader training. This should include the establishment of proper oversight and accountability mechanisms and law of war training for the enlistees and for those overseeing them. The HNSF should also develop processes for acquisition and life-

cycle management of major end items, as well as processes for procurement and accountability of all classes of supply, and contracting of other services or capabilities. Further, at the executive direction levels, the HNSF should establish policies and a system of orders and directives that supports the HN statutory framework and drives standardization of policies and procedures through top-down flow of information and a robust command inspection program. In sum, US mentors, advisors, and trainers charged with conducting SFA activities, and multinational force counterparts, should look beyond the immediate tactical conditions on the ground and collaborate with multiple agencies to develop the supporting infrastructure required for the HNSF to sustain and regenerate itself over the long term.

For more information regarding SC, refer to JP 3-20, Security Cooperation.

19. Foreign Internal Defense

FID is the participation by civilian and military agencies of a government in any of the action programs taken by another government or other designated organization to free and protect its society from subversion, lawlessness, insurgency, terrorism, and other threats to its security. FID focuses on building viable political, economic, military, and security infrastructures and social institutions for the needs of the local population. The focus of all US FID efforts is to support the HN's IDAD program. FID can only occur when there is an HN that has asked for assistance. The US will generally employ a mix of diplomatic, economic, informational, and military instruments of national power in support of these objectives (see Figure VII-3). FID conducted by conventional forces and SOF can assist the HN in reducing these contributing factors to insurgency and terrorism. FID operations involve military training and building infrastructure in conjunction with foreign aid programs administered by DOS. FID operations can be indirect support or direct support (noncombat or combat).

a. **Indirect Support.** These are FID operations that emphasize the principle of HN self-sufficiency. Indirect support focuses on building strong national infrastructures through economic and military capabilities that contribute to self-sufficiency. Normally, this support is provided through operational contract support (OCS).

b. **Direct Support (Not Involving US Combat Operations).** These operations involve the use of US forces providing direct assistance to the HN civilian populace or military. They differ from SA in that they are joint or Service funded, do not usually involve the transfer of arms and equipment, and do not usually, but may, include training local military forces. Direct support operations are normally conducted when the HN has not attained self-sufficiency and is faced with social, economic, or military threats beyond its capability to handle. DOD support could include activities such as providing intelligence, mobility support, or logistics support. This direct support by US forces may also be enhanced by OCS.

c. **US Combat Operations.** The introduction of US combat forces into FID operations requires a Presidential decision and serves only as a temporary solution until




Figure VII-3. Counterinsurgency and Foreign Internal Defense Interaction Scale

HN forces are able to stabilize the situation and provide security for the populace. If combat is authorized, normally this will include major operations.

For further information, refer to JP 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense.

20. Counterterrorism Operations

a. **CT and COIN.** An insurgent normally applies military power against military forces; a terrorist unlawfully uses violence against civilians. Elements of an insurgency often use terrorism as a means to influence local, domestic, and international audiences. Thus, a JFC may be simultaneously conducting COIN operations and CT.

b. **Nature of CT Operations.** CT requires the sustained global CT effort of all relevant USG departments and agencies and PNs, each with unique capabilities, perspectives, and authorities. Over time, by locating and defeating terrorist organizations and networks, they will be rendered incapable or unwilling to use terrorism to achieve their

goals. CT activities and operations may support COIN operations, stability activities, or other major operations and campaigns. CT activities and operations are especially useful to bring both military and civilian capabilities to bear in a focused manner against state and non-state actors who use terrorism.

c. **Types of CT Activities.** There are three broad types of CT activities: advise and assist activities, overseas CT activities, and support to civil authorities activities. Advise and assist activities are all US military efforts to improve other nations' ability to provide security for its citizens, govern, provide services, prevent terrorists from using the nation's territory as a safe haven, and promote long-term regional stability. Some of the overseas CT activities include: offense, defense, and stability activities; COIN operations; PO; and counterdrug operations.

d. **Ends, Ways, and Means of CT Operations During COIN.** The elimination of the insurgent movement's ability or willingness to conduct terrorist acts against US and HN facilities, personnel, and interests. The ways of CT operations are to capture, kill, or influence to neutralize terrorist cell leadership and key subordinates; isolate terrorists from their supporting administrative and logistic infrastructure; and dismantle their capabilities and bases. The means of CT operations are the application of whole-of-government, HN, and multinational CT capabilities operating seamlessly through the levels of warfare to disrupt, isolate, and dismantle the terrorist organizations. Additionally, means include influencing relevant populations and impacting the OE.

For additional information regarding CT, refer to JP 3-26, Counterterrorism.

21. Electronic Warfare

a. All modern forces depend on the EMS. The military requirement for unimpeded access to, and use of, the EMS is the key focus for joint EMS operations, both in support of military operations and as the focus of operations themselves. EW is essential for protecting friendly operations and denying adversary operations in the EMS throughout the OE.

b. **EW's Role in COIN.** During COIN operations, insurgents may operate with unsophisticated electronic means to achieve their objectives. EW contributes to success by using offensive and defensive tactics and techniques in a variety of combinations to shape, disrupt, and exploit insurgent use of the EMS while protecting friendly freedom of action.

c. EW is a complex mission area that should be fully integrated with other aspects of COIN operations. Integration requires careful planning. EW planners should coordinate their planned activities with all users and within all aspects of the operations that use the EMS, to include HN and other third-party users that EW does not wish to disrupt.

Refer to JP 3-13.1, Electronic Warfare, for additional information regarding EW.

22. Cyberspace Operations

The joint force relies on cyberspace for a broad range of mission-related activities. At the same time, the increasing reliance on cyberspace technology as a means of disseminating messages by the insurgents has provided an LOE joint forces can use to attack insurgents. Cyberspace operations provide security within the environment and help to isolate insurgents within the affected area or separate them from external support secured through cyberspace. Insurgent funding requirements may require reliance on criminal activities, piracy, and smuggling as the common means to secure funds. Crime threatens freedom and commerce within cyberspace, undermines economic security, and contributes to the destabilization of governance and the security situation. Insurgents and terrorists use laptops, external memory devices, and DVDs [digital video devices] at Internet cafés and safe houses for clandestine communications and information management. They can, with sufficient quality, replicate the training, administration, C2, and planning capabilities required to sustain their activities and attacks on joint forces. Carefully planned cyberspace operations are capable of creating the effects to deny the enemy freedom of action and maintain US and joint forces freedom of maneuver in support of COIN operations. As with the employment of any capabilities in COIN, all of the potential desired and undesired effects, including friendly fire and collateral damage, should be considered.

a. Offensive cyberspace operations (OCO) should be considered if the insurgency is utilizing cyberspace to recruit or obtain funding, weapons, equipment, direct operation, or intelligence. OCO may complement actions in the physical domains.

b. Defensive cyberspace operations (DCO) detect and respond to enemy or threat actions involving malicious cyberspace activity on friendly networks and may trigger other events or operations to protect freedom of maneuver or HN governance, sovereignty, people, and critical infrastructure from insurgent operations. DCO also assure HN use of cyberspace in support of the free flow of commerce and sustained logistics. DCO and OCO are vital as force multipliers to identify insurgent activities and create conditions to deny or defeat insurgent operations both in cyberspace and in the physical domains.

c. SFA may assist the HN to build or improve its cyberspace capability and capacity. The cyberspace component of security includes HN telecommunications, interagency organizations, and military C2 communications that may be loosely affiliated with the HN governance organizations.

23. Air Operations

Air forces' capabilities include CAS, precision strikes, PR, air interdiction, intelligence, communications, EW, combat support, counterair, airspace control, and air mobility. Air forces and capabilities may provide considerable advantages to counterinsurgents, especially by denying insurgents secrecy and unfettered access to bases of operation. If insurgents assemble a conventional force or their operating locations are identified and isolated, air assets can respond quickly with joint precision fires or to airlift ground forces to locations to accomplish a mission. Air operations enables COIN

operations in rough and remote terrain, areas that insurgents traditionally have considered somewhat safe from surveillance and attack.

a. **Air C2.** The C2 relationships established for operations should consider both the need for flexibility and the training level of forces to be employed. As in all military operations, air operations should be able to provide precision strikes operations due to the nature of COIN and the demand for low collateral damage and friendly fire.

(1) **C2 Architecture.** The joint force air component can integrate and deconflict the unique HN, multinational, and/or interagency partner aviation capabilities with those employed by the joint force. This integration and deconfliction facilitates the safety of all aircraft operating within the operational area and supports the efficient use of available airspace and air facilities.

For additional discussion, refer to JP 3-30, Command and Control of Joint Air Operations.

(2) **Planning.** Air planners require visibility and awareness from the time planning begins and throughout each phase, of actions planned at all echelons to provide the most effective air support, so coordination should occur at all levels. Furthermore, COIN planning is often fluid and develops along short planning and execution timelines, necessitating some degree of informal coordination and integration for safety and efficiency.

b. **Air Mobility.** Air mobility aircraft provide the joint force with the ability to perform intertheater and intratheater transport of cargo, equipment, and personnel. This transport can include deployment to remote regions to deliver resources and personnel and can be used to rapidly deploy, sustain, and reinforce ground forces as part of security and counterinsurgency operations. Air mobility can be used to support objectives by extending effective governance to remote areas and delivering highly visible humanitarian aid. Sustainment tasks are enabled through air land, airdrop, and aerial extraction of equipment, supplies, and personnel. Fixed-wing transports are best suited for carrying ground forces into forward staging areas. Vertical-lift platforms are ideal for carrying ground forces to remote sites that are unable to support fixed-wing operations. Lift capable of moving small units around the battlefield have proven very valuable in assisting COIN forces. The ability to maneuver while engaged with a threat is extremely powerful in managing the battle and ensuring the threat is unable to disengage at a time and place of the threat's choosing. Casualty evacuation is integral to any operation involving the employment of personnel in hostile-fire situations, with vertical-lift assets best suited for this task. While land forces can execute these basic missions alone, airlift bypasses weaknesses insurgents have traditionally exploited. However, airlift is more costly than surface or maritime transportation and in some circumstances may be inhibited by terrain, weather, and threats such as man-portable surface-to-air missiles and rocket-propelled grenades. Also, requesting airlift may be subject to limitations due to availability and other priority requirements. It is usually a small percentage of the overall transportation network during major operations; however, in particularly challenging situations, airlift may become the primary transportation mode for sustainment and repositioning of forces.

c. **Precision Engagement.** The joint force air component can provide CAS, air interdiction, and strikes that include the use of precision-guided munitions. The use of fires, regardless of source, against insurgents should be carefully considered and targets confirmed in terms of their authenticity and value. They must also be lawful objectives under the law of war (combatants or military objectives). The use of lethal force must respect the principles of military necessity, distinction, proportionality, humanity, and honor. Additionally, insurgents may have signature reduction methods, deception methods, and man-portable air defense systems that should be considered and addressed.

Refer to JP 3-09.3, Close Air Support, for additional information on CAS.

(1) **Air Operations.** In determining the appropriate capability to create the desired effect, planners should look at not only the direct but at the longer-term, indirect effects that may be created. Collateral damage and civilian casualties can be portrayed by the insurgents as unnecessary, and if perceived as such by the local population, it does much to undermine COIN. Insurgents will inevitably exploit such incidents especially through propaganda, using international media coverage when possible.

(2) **Intelligence.** Just as in traditional warfare, attacks on key nodes usually reap greater benefits than attacks on dispersed individual targets. Effective strike operations are inextricably tied to the availability of timely, accurate, and precise intelligence; effective intelligence collection; and detailed systems analysis that identifies and fully characterizes the potential targets of interest. Persistence is critical, as it is often not known in advance how long a particular node will remain stationary.

(3) **HN Precision Engagement.** If US or multinational forces conduct the strike, there may be the perception that the HN government is dependent on foreign forces for its survival. This may have the indirect effect of delegitimizing the HN government in the public's perception. Precision engagement should be planned to employ HN air resources to the greatest extent possible. Properly trained and structured teams of air advisors, ranging from planning liaison to tactical operations personnel, offer potential for HN unilateral and combined actions against high-value targets. Use of assets controlled by US agencies outside DOD, but not directly affiliated with it, may also prove useful in providing precision strike capability.

d. **Interoperability Between Ground and Air Operations.** Video downlink and data link technology have revolutionized real-time air to ground employment allowing air assets to seamlessly integrate into and support the ground commander's scheme of maneuver. Armed aircraft on-call or scheduled as airborne force escorts may provide ground forces with the critical situational awareness, flexibility for maneuver, and immediate fire support necessary to succeed during COIN operations. Air operations ability to quickly support ground forces can reduce the risk to dispersed ground units, lower the need for mutual support between ground units, and therefore decrease overall troop requirements. This allows counterinsurgents to further disperse ground forces in areas and in numbers that would not be feasible without air—mutual support can come from the air rather than from other ground forces or indirect ground fire. Dispersion of ground forces facilitates the actual and perceived level of security. However, joint planners should

carefully balance the risk of catastrophic tactical surprise of dispersed ground forces with the benefits gained from dispersion. Additionally, air operations can provide battlefield air operations capabilities which include air traffic control, assault zone assessment, establishment and control, joint terminal attack control, fire support, operational preparation of the environment, SR, C2 communications, personnel and equipment recovery, humanitarian relief, and air evacuation.

e. **PR.** As previously stated, COIN encompasses operations characterized by violence, persistent conflict, and increasing state fragility. In an environment with such fluidity, PR planning should encompass the widest range of operations, from a struggling state to a failed state and everything in between. For planners at all levels, this means planning for search and rescue in permissive environments, to PR, and nonconventional assisted recovery in environments where other types of recovery are not feasible or possible. Plans should include the capabilities of interagency organizations and our multinational partners. See JP 3-50, *Personnel Recovery*, for specific PR planning guidance.

f. **Basing.** During COIN operations, the joint or multinational force (along with HN forces) will use the available air facilities provided by the HN or will construct expeditionary airfields. COIN planners should consider where to locate airfields, including those intended for use as aerial ports of debarkation and other air operations, as well as the ability to develop and sustain ground transportation networks. US air forces frequently build and provide infrastructure to HN air services as part of performing COIN operations. Air operations from remote or dispersed airfields may present a smaller signature than large numbers of land forces, possibly lessening HN sensitivities to foreign military presence. Employment of long-range air capabilities for COIN operations has increased due to technological advances in the accuracy of precision munitions, the number of munitions that can be transported by each aircraft, global satellite connectivity, and the aircraft's endurance. Often these platforms are free from the basing limitations of shorter-range tactical platforms. Commanders should ensure all logistics and maintenance requirements are properly considered for remote and austere locations. Additionally, commanders should properly protect their bases and personnel from air; ballistic missile; guided rocket, artillery, and missile; mortar; and IED threats.

g. **Building HN Air Capability.** Where appropriate, US and multinational aviation SFA operations strive to enable the HN to provide its own sustainable air capability. Air capability can be a catalyst for government legitimacy, projecting national sovereignty, and accelerating the nation's overall internal stability as well as regional security. Rebuilding HN air capability will require long lead times. Planners, therefore, need to establish a long-term program to develop an HN air capability. The HN air force should be appropriate for that nation's requirements and sustainment base. For conducting effective COIN operations, an HN air force may be able to provide aerial reconnaissance and surveillance, air transport, CAS and interdiction for land forces, helicopter troop lift, medical evacuation, and counter air. Likewise, airlift supports essential services, governance, and economic development by providing movement of personnel and supplies, particularly in a COIN operation with IEDs and other dangers on the roads. Thus, HNSF should include airlift development as the HN's first air component. To build HN air capability, the joint force

will focus on providing HN air forces with training and equipment services so they can become capable of independent operations in compliance with the law of war. Infrastructure, to include airfields and a viable air traffic control system construction and development, is also frequently required. Development of supporting services (maintenance, logistics, and planning) often requires the most extensive timelines when working with HN air services. HN air services often include a mixture of civil and military aviation assets that provides unique challenges to air operations.

24. Space Operations

Space capabilities provide advantages needed for success. Space contributions to COIN include intelligence collection; satellite communications (SATCOM); and positioning, navigation, and timing (PNT). Space operations provide insight into the AOIs or OE including threat actions and capabilities. Monitoring AOIs from space helps provide information on enemy location, disposition, and intent and aids in tracking, targeting, and engaging the threat. It also provides situational awareness, warning of attack, and feedback on how well US forces are affecting the adversaries' understanding of the OE. Space forces support the COIN's ability to concentrate combat power at the proper time and place by providing SATCOM to coordinate and direct forces, and PNT to synchronize operations, navigate, and guide precision munitions. PNT provides essential, precise, and reliable information that permits joint forces to more effectively plan, train, coordinate, and execute operations. Precision timing provides the joint force the capability to synchronize operations and enables communications capabilities, such as frequency hopping and cryptologic synchronization, to improve communications security and effectiveness. PNT also enables precision attack from stand-off distances, thereby reducing collateral damage and allowing friendly forces to avoid threat areas.

For additional information, see JP 3-14, Space Operations; JP 3-17, Air Mobility Operations; JP 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense; Air Force Doctrine Annex (AFDA) 3-2, Irregular Warfare; AFDA 3-17, Air Mobility Operations; AFDA 3-05, Special Operations; AFDA 3-14, Space Operations; AFDA 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense; FM 3-14, Army Space Operations; and FM 3-24/MCWP 3-02, Insurgencies and Countering Insurgencies.

25. Maritime Operations

The expeditionary character of maritime forces may provide access when access from the other operational areas is denied or limited. Maritime forces may provide direct support to the joint force that does not include combat operations, to include logistic support, intelligence and communication sharing, FHA, and medical care.

a. **MSO.** MSO may be used to counter terrorism, insurgency, and crime, while complementing the effort to protect the HN, its sovereignty, the people, and critical infrastructure from insurgents. It also facilitates access to HN ports and free flow of commerce and sustained logistics support through the waterways. Coastal riverine units provide security along inland waterways, which helps to isolate insurgents within the affected area or, if the river is an international border, from external support. Piracy threatens freedom and safety of maritime navigation, undermines economic security, and

contributes to the destabilization of governance and the security situation. MSO can be used to provide the HN's access to sea lines of communications, while eliminating a source of funding used for sustaining insurgent operations.

b. Deterrence and Patrols. Maritime support to COIN may consist of deterrence, escort operations, presence, patrols, and defending critical infrastructure. Maritime interception operations are used to enforce sanctions or blockades, support law enforcement operations, and provide a means to extend situational awareness. The presence of maritime forces can be adjusted as conditions dictate to enable flexible approaches to escalation, de-escalation, and deterrence. A visible presence just offshore demonstrates support for a PN, which may send a strong message to insurgents and their sympathizers. Maritime forces' ability to loiter over the horizon may reduce a large US footprint while still maintaining the ability to influence COIN operations being conducted ashore.

c. Sustainment and Transport. Maritime forces can provide land-based forces with key sustainment capabilities. This includes commercial vessels' provision of the majority of bulk supplies. The expeditionary nature of maritime forces, however, may transport forces within the theater as well. Maritime forces can also provide a forcible entry capability for insurgent-controlled areas or bases bordering waterways or in the littorals.

d. Maritime Aircraft. Maritime aircraft are multi-mission platforms which provide rapid response capabilities such as precision strikes, C2, EW, and combat search and rescue. Maritime aircraft have the added flexibility in that aircraft carriers and other air capable ships are self-sustaining, secure bases that can be quickly repositioned. Theater-based maritime patrol aircraft further complement the flexibility with their endurance capability.

e. Precision Strikes and Maritime Fires. Maritime forces also are capable of launching precision-guided munitions from surface or subsurface platforms, while surface combatants can conduct naval surface fire support for expeditionary forces ashore.

f. Building HN Maritime Capability. SFA also applies to assisting the HN with building or improving its maritime capability and capacity. The maritime component of security forces includes HN navy, marine, and coast guard elements, and interagency organizations which may be loosely affiliated with the HN maritime organization. These may include fishery patrols, interior security, port authority, customs, and immigration. Further considerations to enhance the HN maritime capability may include establishment or expansion of maritime domain awareness efforts. Development of a robust automated identification system, tied into an interagency maritime operations center, will increase the HN's ability to track and identify vessels of interest that are potentially involved in illegal or illicit activities. SFA planners should develop a long-term plan to assist the HN in these areas. As with the land and air, assistance to the maritime elements of an HN should be appropriate for that nation's abilities, requirements, and sustainment base.

g. Maritime Support to CA. The maritime component may also contribute to the HN rebuilding effort with maritime subject matter experts to CA teams who have skill sets

uniquely tailored to those areas most likely to influence HN rebuilding efforts in maritime and naval affairs.

For additional information regarding maritime operations, refer to JP 3-32, Command and Control of Joint Maritime Operations.

26. Detainee Operations

a. **General.** How counterinsurgents treat captured insurgents has immense potential impact on insurgent morale, retention, and recruitment. Humane and just treatment may afford counterinsurgents many short-term opportunities, as well as potentially damaging insurgent recruitment. Abuse may foster resentment and hatred, offering the enemy an opportunity for propaganda and assist potential insurgent recruitment and support. It is important all detainees or other persons captured in any conflict, regardless of how it is characterized, shall be treated, at a minimum, in accordance with Common Article 3 of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, unless they are entitled to a more protective standard based on status. How a commander responds to allegations of abuse or failure to follow minimum standards of humane treatment greatly contributes to overall performance of personnel involved in detention operations. Commanders should quickly and thoroughly investigate suspected, reported, or alleged inhumane treatment to prevent future violations of international law and degrade potential insurgent propaganda and recruitment. Commanders at the strategic and operational level should establish reporting and investigating requirements to ensure international obligations are met and strategic objectives are not compromised.

b. **Detainees.** Counterinsurgents should carefully consider who will be detained and the manner and methods that will be used to detain them. Detainees can be vital sources of information of intelligence value. Counterinsurgents detaining people who are not part of the insurgency or do not support insurgency damages the counterinsurgents' credibility and legitimacy; thus, ill-defined, poorly supervised detainee operations can prolong the war, increase resentment, and undermine any efforts to alleviate grievances or discredit the insurgents' narrative. I2 products can provide substantial support to effective detainee operations, including decisions to detain an individual, interrogation activities, and follow-on prosecution.

c. **Detention.** The methods and infrastructure for detention of insurgents are complex and important. The exact chain of custody over detainees and responsibility is vitally important and should be carefully planned, prepared, and conducted. Detainees should be biometrically enrolled as quickly as possible following initial detention. Biometric database searches on incoming detainees can frequently reveal additional infractions, further justifying continued detention. At a minimum, it provides a tracking tool for every individual detained for whatever reason across the country. It also provides a highly effective tool in support of interrogation. The infrastructure and sustainment effort should be able to cope with the volume of people in detention. The methods and perception regarding the release of personnel in detention is also important. Fairness may help the counterinsurgent cause while any negative perceptions will hurt said cause in the long term.

For those in custody, reintegration efforts should begin as soon as possible. Detention should protect and empower moderate detainees.

d. **Detainee Programs.** It is vital that detainees have voluntary access to a wide array of programs. These programs help protect moderate detainees from extremist influence, prepare them for release, and encourage them to not rejoin the insurgency when released. While the programs should be tailored for each area and insurgency, they can include vocational, educational, and religious programs.

e. **Release Authority.** For transfer or release authority of US-captured detainees during COIN, the Secretary of Defense or designee shall establish criteria for transfer or release and communicate those criteria to all commanders operating within the operational area. How to reintegrate released detainees into the societies from which they hail is of vital importance and requires careful planning. Coordination is required with respect to the local governmental and security forces of the area that the detainee will be released to, especially if this was the same area where the individual was detained. Release procedures and policy should be closely coordinated with DDR.

Refer to JP 3-63, Detainee Operations, for more information regarding detainee operations.

27. Countering Threat Networks

a. The worldwide emergence of adaptive threat networks presents a challenge to joint forces in all operations, to include the conduct of COIN operations. Threat networks vary widely in motivation, structure, activities, operational areas, and composition. Threat networks may be adversarial to COIN forces or may simply be criminally motivated, increasing instability in a given operational area. CTN consists of activities to place pressure on the threat networks and mitigate their adverse effects.

b. The purpose of CTN activities is to shape the OE, deter aggression, provide freedom of movement, and defeat threat networks when necessary. CTN activities can happen at any level of conflict and may include or be part of military engagement, SC (includes SFA and FID), deterrence, AT, CT, counterdrug, enforcement of sanctions, no-fly zones, show of force, and COIN.

c. **Fundamentals.** A network is a group of elements consisting of interconnected nodes and links representing relationships or associations. A cell is a smaller network that is within a larger network that is formed around a specific process, capability, or activity. A node is an element of a network that represents a person, place, or physical object. Nodes represent tangible elements within a network or OE that can be targeted for action. A link is a behavioral, physical, or functional relationship between nodes. Links establish the interconnectivity between nodes that allows them to work together as a network to accomplish a task or perform a function. Nodes and links are useful in identifying COGs, networks, and cells the commander and staff may wish to influence or change.

d. Network analysis is a means of gaining understanding of a group, place, physical object, or system. It identifies relevant nodes, determines and analyzes links between

nodes, and identifies key nodes. The PMESII systems perspective is a useful starting point for analysis of threat networks. Networks are typically formed at the confluence of three conditions: the presence of a catalyst, a receptive audience, and an accommodating environment.

e. Threat networks often attempt to remain hidden. Understanding the basic, often masked sustainment functions of a given threat network, commanders may also identify individual networks within. A thorough JIPOE product, coupled with “on-the-ground” assessment, observation, and all-source intelligence collection, will ultimately lead to an understanding of the OE and will allow the commander to visualize the network. To neutralize or defeat a threat network, friendly forces should do more than understand how the threat network operates, its organization goals, and its place in the social order; they should also understand how the threat is shaping its environment to maintain popular support, recruit, and raise funds.

f. **CTN During COIN.** Of the known threat networks, the vast majority possess the characteristics of an insurgency: an element of the larger group is conducting insurgent type operations, or the group is providing assistance in the form of funding, training, or fighters to another insurgency.

Refer to JP 3-25, Countering Threat Networks, for more information regarding CTN.

28. Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Activities

a. Insurgents have commonly relied on IEDs as a means of delivering fires against friendly forces and civilians. IEDs have the capability, if not countered and neutralized, of hindering the operational momentum of COIN and creating the effects of terrorism and insecurity that can erode HN government legitimacy.

b. IEDs may incorporate military munitions and hardware but are generally constructed from components that are nonmilitary in nature. IEDs are employed by threat groups across the globe to achieve their objectives. This is, in part, due to their potential to produce strategic effects beyond their tactical impact. IEDs are designed to kill opponents and influence their actions, discredit them among the populace, and degrade their ability to achieve their objectives. Insurgents employ IEDs to demonstrate their freedom of action; demoralize, distract, and discredit US, multinational, and HNSF; create fear within the general population; gain media exposure; and negatively impact US, HN, and PN interests. Meeting this threat requires a national effort based on a whole-of-government approach that addresses the device, the network that designs and emplaces the device, and the social-political aspects of the OE that facilitate IED employment.

c. Countering IEDs requires both removing threat anonymity and the improvement of TTP and equipment through exploitation of the devices and analysis of blast effects. Insurgents, terrorists, and criminals can all negatively affect COIN operations through their use of IEDs. One of their greatest assets is their ability to operate clandestinely, preserving anonymity among the general population. As a result, identity activities and network analysis are critical activities for identifying threat individuals and isolating them from

their network of supporters, suppliers, and sympathizers. In addition to accurately identifying threat actors, the devices themselves should be exploited using technical, biometric, forensic, and other material exploitation skills. The intelligence gained from exploitation should rapidly inform training, modification of TTP, and modification of equipment or development of new equipment. This exploitation will be a dynamic process, as the threat has demonstrated the ability to continually modify IED material composition, triggering mechanisms and employment techniques. During COIN operations, the JFC should ensure the deployment of assets to counter IEDs, specify and continue to modify required predeployment training, request assets for exploitation, and ensure lessons learned feedback is provided to the Defense Threat Reduction Agency's Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization and Service-specific lessons learned repositories.

For additional information regarding countering IED activities, refer to JP 3-15.1, Counter-Improvised Explosive Device Activities.

29. Counter Threat Finance Activities

a. **CTF.** CTF activities deny, disrupt, destroy, or defeat the generation, storage, movement, and use of assets to fund activities that support a threat's ability to negatively affect US interests. CTF is a way to exploit or shut down threat networks. CTF activities are planned and conducted by US military forces and the cooperating members of the international community from the strategic to the tactical level.

b. **The Insurgent Financial Network.** No two threat networks are the same; however, there are a number of similarities.

(1) Insurgents may generate funds through a multitude of means that range from local to international efforts both overt and covert. Funds may come from individuals, groups, businesses, criminal networks, and donor states. Activities may also involve fraud and use of front companies. Insurgents can generate funds through illicit collection of taxes, duties, counterfeiting, black marketing, narcotics and human trafficking, illicit proliferation of natural resources, and kidnapping for ransoms.

(2) Insurgents will launder and move funds locally and globally. Effective organizations are shrewd, calculating, and security minded, and they use global financial systems, front companies, and under-governed, corrupt, or unregistered money services. States lacking secure governance of these financial institutions provided added security. Targeting these institutions can also affect the local population that utilizes these services.

c. **Roles.** CTF requires a balancing of national security resources and a recognition of the shared responsibility for this mission among foreign policy and legal authorities, national policy authorities, the military, law enforcement, and the intelligence community.

(1) The Defense Intelligence Agency provides DOD TFI contributions to foreign intelligence and counterintelligence and serves as the intelligence conduit for CCMDs and other USG departments and agencies and as lead for coordinating DOD TFI support to meet CCMD requirements. The Defense Intelligence Agency leads TFI efforts to align analysis, collection, and ISR activities with operations and link and synchronize defense

and national intelligence capabilities in support of TFI requirements for DOD CTF activities.

(2) USSOCOM leads and coordinates DOD CTF activities to ensure applicable integration, standardization, synchronization, and effectiveness within DOD and with other interagency partners. This includes the development of CTF planning frameworks to inform DOD and geographic CCMD planning processes; establish, maintain, and convene CTF collaborative activities; and establish assessment standards and aggregating CCMD assessments of progress against specific challenges and transnational threats. USSOCOM is responsible for CTF training and education standards for SOF units and individuals.

(3) CCMDs plan, execute, and assess their assigned DOD CTF activities. This includes establishing a dedicated CTF capacity that integrates intelligence and operations, analyzes financial intelligence, and coordinates planning and execution of DOD CTF activities with the lead interagency partner for each identified threat.

(4) Services provide predeployment training for Service members who may support CTF. They provide CTF education in professional military education, and they are responsible for ensuring CTF training is provided to specialists that function to influence the OE. Services also track personnel with CTF training or education to assist commanders in identifying personnel who might be available to assist them in operations or additional training.

d. **Operations.** CTF operations include squeezing profits and revenue sources and streams; driving up operational, financing, and transactions costs and risks; identifying, tracking, and interdicting commercial and financial transactions and smuggling activities; and freezing or seizing real property and other physical capital assets and financial capital assets and reserves. At the tactical level, service members can conduct threat finance exploitation after seizing a hostile position. At the operational and strategic level, Service members with CTF training or education can be assigned to a TFC and work with interagency partners, HN governmental specialists, or multinational experts.

e. **Uses.** CTF can be used in COIN to counter, disrupt, or interdict the flow of finances to an insurgency, thereby reducing its operational effectiveness. Additionally, CTF can be used against corruption, as well as drug and other criminal money-making activities that fund or fuel insurgencies and undermine the legitimacy of the HN government. In such cases, CTF is aimed at insurgent organizations as well as other malevolent actors in the environment.

For a broader discussion of CTF, see Department of Defense Directive (DODD) 5205.14, DOD Counter Threat Finance (CTF) Policy, and CJCSI 3210.06, Irregular Warfare.

For more specific application of CTF, see JP 3-25, Countering Threat Networks.

30. Public Affairs

a. **General.** PA supports the commander's COIN objectives and helps shape the OE through the release of timely, truthful, and accurate information about operations and

interaction with internal and external audiences. PA can communicate operational objectives and activities in a manner that counters insurgent and other adversary propaganda and disinformation, thereby aiding in enhancing US, HN, and international public support of COIN.

b. **Perceptions.** Insurgents and counterinsurgents know popular perception drives support, and such public support is vital to success. HN and US information, the media's reporting, insurgent propaganda, and other contributors to the information environment influence how the populace perceives COIN, the insurgency, and the HN's legitimacy. A commitment to releasing timely, truthful, and accurate information, whether good or bad, builds trust and supports the credibility of the HN and US. The power of timely, truthful, and accurate release of information, hinges, however, on the alignment of actions, words, and images. This alignment and consistency is essential to support strategic and operational approaches to COIN. If what is said or shown is not what was or is being done, credibility becomes suspect and possibly destroyed. This pushes what once may have been favorable perceptions in the direction of the insurgents. The counterinsurgents' PA should always avoid negatively impacting the perception of neutral, independent, and impartial humanitarian participants.

c. **Timeliness, Tone, and Context.** Timeliness does not always mean immediate or rapid. In many cases, however, the quick release of information through PA to the public can set the tone and the context of a situation and the reporting and public dialogue that follows. Being "first to the chalkboard" with accurate and truthful information provides an advantage that can impact narratives and support US and HN credibility. It will not always be possible to release information quickly enough to create this advantage and will not always counter or negate insurgent disinformation, but establishing the story in the US and HN's tone and context will almost always create an advantage.

d. **Understanding the OE.** Close coordination among PA, intelligence, information operations, MISO, and other LOOs and LOEs is critical to understanding the OE. Each will likely bring unique information and confirming information to the effort. There are also overlaps in the specific types of information most applicable to them in the planning and execution of their operations. Due to the small number of personnel in some of these functions, the JFC should minimize duplication of efforts and look for efficiencies through the proactive sharing of information.

e. **Communication Planning and Execution.** Communication planning and execution requires close coordination, deconfliction, and synchronization among PA, MISO, CMO, and other related functions. This improves consistency in communicating themes, messages, narratives, and other information, adapted as necessary, to key audiences. The best communication results are realized when PA, MISO, CMO, and other related functions are coordinated and synchronized early in the planning process. Many PA activities and some by other LOOs will simultaneously or independently support public diplomacy or otherwise be connected with the efforts of DOS, other USG departments and agencies, HN, other nations, and NGOs.

f. **Assessment.** PA should be an integral part of operational assessment discussed in Chapter VI, “Assessment.” Close coordination among these LOOs and LOEs is critical to effective assessment. Significant assessment requirement overlaps exist among them. Due to the small number of personnel in some of these functions, the JFC should minimize duplication of efforts and look for efficiencies through the proactive sharing of information.

g. **Community Engagement.** PA provides specialized skills in communicating, developing relationships, and interacting with local communities while conducting operations. PA should be involved in the planning, preparation, and execution of community engagements within the local/HN communities to support the plan. PA should have a basic understanding of nonlethal weapons ability to minimize civilian casualties and limit collateral damage to answer questions appropriately and minimize reactions.

h. **Support to Public Diplomacy.** PA activities should be planned and coordinated with any other activities supporting public diplomacy and DOS to ensure unity of effort and maximum effect.

i. **Joint Public Affairs Support Element (JPASE).** The JPASE is part of US Transportation Command’s Joint Enabling Capabilities Command. JPASE provides ready, scalable, and rapidly deployable joint PA capability to CCDRs to facilitate rapid establishment of joint force headquarters, bridge joint PA requirements, and conduct PA training to meet theater information challenges. JPASE provides JFCs with trained, equipped, scalable, and expeditionary joint PA capabilities supporting worldwide operations. Like similar on-call forces, they are designed to respond quickly to the emergent situation until longer-term forces are deployed.

31. Intelligence Support to Operations

Effective COIN is enabled by timely and reliable intelligence, gathered and analyzed at all levels and disseminated throughout the force. A process develops where operations produce intelligence that contribute to the conduct of subsequent operations. Reporting by units, members of the country team, and information derived from interactions with civilian agencies is often of equal or greater importance than reporting by specialized intelligence assets. This reporting may be both solicited and unsolicited information from the relevant population or insurgency defectors. In all cases, corroboration of the information retains significant importance to prevent acting upon false, misleading, or circular reporting. These factors, along with the need to generate a favorable operational tempo, drive the requirement to produce and disseminate intelligence at the lowest practical level. The perishable nature of some intelligence requires commanders to establish organizational architectures that provide operations and intelligence fusion at the lowest possible tactical level. Also, units should deploy analytical capacity as far forward as possible so the analyst is close—in time and space—to the supported commander.

32. Identity Activities

a. **General.** Identity activities assist US forces, the HN, and PNs to positively identify, track, characterize, and disrupt threats conducting and facilitating insurgent

activities in the OE. Identity activities enablers include a dedicated information-sharing architecture with access to national-level biometrics, forensics, DOMEX, and derogatory reporting databases; expeditionary exploitation facilities; and TTP for individual encounters, site exploitation, and evidentiary handling, as well as training on fielded collection devices. When employed appropriately, identity activities can provide commanders with decision quality information on insurgent actors, their activities, possible intent, and tools of their trade.

b. Operations. Identity activities range from encounter-based and targeted collection activities like checkpoint or census operations; site exploitation activities including follow-on forensic, engineering, and captured media analysis; analysis and production; and support to follow-on planning. Sociocultural factors should be taken into consideration when conducting some identity activities (e.g., biometrics collection), as they may be seen as overly intrusive by the general population. However, when conducted in concert with HN forces, identity activities can greatly increase operational precision, as well as the general security of the HN population.

c. Identity Activities Support to Operations. Identity activities support provides the analytic rigor behind the positive identification and characterization of individuals encountered within the OE. Identity activities support to operations assists commanders in identifying insurgents and their networks, isolating them from the target population, and making decisions to neutralize their effects.

d. Enhancing HN Identity Activities Capabilities. SFA may include assisting the HN with developing or improving its identity activities capability and capacity. These improvements may include training, equipping, and partnering activities using biometrics, forensics, and DOMEX capabilities. COIN planners should develop a long-term plan to assist the HN in these areas.

33. Violent Extremism

a. VE refers to advocating, engaging in, preparing, or otherwise supporting ideologically motivated or justified violence to further social, economic, and political objectives. While VE and insurgency share many of the same core grievances, they differ in their degree of organizational support base and use of violence. VE, for example, often manifests itself at the individual level and in highly informal, diffuse networks. Such networks are often transregional in character, while insurgencies are often delineated by geography. Also, VE can exist in quite stable environments, as well as uncertain and hostile contexts associated with insurgencies. In certain cases, VE, insurgency, and terrorism can overlap.

b. Conditions that Enable VE and VEOs

(1) Push factors are important in creating the conditions that favor the rise or spread in appeal of VE or insurgency. Push factors drive people to VE or to join a VEO. Examples of push factors could include:

- (a) High levels of social marginalization and fragmentation.

- (b) Poorly governed or under governed areas.
- (c) Government repression and human rights violations.
- (d) Endemic corruption and elite impunity.
- (e) Perceived threat to unique cultures.

(2) Pull factors are necessary for push factors to have a direct influence on individual-level radicalization and recruitment. Pull factors attract people to VE or to join a VEO. They are typically associated with the personal rewards that may be provided through VE or through participation in a VEO's activities that membership may confer. Examples of pull factors could include:

- (a) Access to material resources, social status, and respect from peers.
- (b) A sense of belonging, adventure, and self-esteem or personal empowerment to counter an individual or groups' view that they have been victimized or marginalized.
- (c) The prospect of achieving glory, fame, or martyrdom.

APPENDIX A BUILDING GOVERNANCE

“With a few exceptions, lasting insurgency endings are shaped not by military action but by social, economic, and political change. At their core, insurgencies are battles for the control of public support.... The government may defeat the insurgent military cadre, but, with few exceptions, insurgencies do not end until case-specific roots are addressed.”

Ben Connable and Martin Libicki, *How Insurgencies End* (2010: RAND)

1. Principles of Governance

Supporting indigenous governance is often an important COIN tool to counter insurgent efforts to seize, nullify, or challenge governing authorities.

a. **Governance.** Governance consists of the rules, processes, and behavior by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in a society. These rules and processes should be seen as predictable and acceptable in the eyes of the population. They are manifested in three core functions: representation, security, and welfare.

(1) **Representation** includes political participation, decision-making procedures, responsiveness to the needs of the population, and accountability for decisions and their implementation. The effectiveness and legitimacy of representation depend on their appropriateness in the local context. For example, participatory governance does not necessarily equate to Western-style democratic institutions; it could consist of local shuras—informal gatherings of village or tribal leaders common in some countries in the Middle East and Central Asia.

(2) **Security** pertains to the maintenance of a monopoly (or at least superiority) over the legitimate use of force. It includes border defense, protection of the population/public security, and maintenance of law and order.

(3) **Welfare** refers to the delivery of services according to the expectations of relevant local populations. Service delivery in this context does not refer to a suite of public services derived from Western states’ or international development models but rather to baseline expectations of the local population in a given operational area if they are to deem governance legitimate.

b. **Counter the Insurgency Narrative.** The challenge for counterinsurgents is to correctly identify those deficiencies in governance that serve as effective motives for the insurgency. It is these deficiencies that are exploited by insurgents to mobilize popular support for the insurgency. If an underrepresented segment of the population provides the majority of insurgent recruits and is susceptible to the insurgency narrative based on its lack of access to political participation and decision making, LOEs should primarily focus on the representation function of governance rather than security or welfare. Similarly, any COIN LOEs focused on service delivery should normally target those inadequate

services that are being exploited in the insurgency narrative. Ideally, a small number of key activities can then be directed along the most promising LOEs to weaken the insurgency.

c. **Do Fewer Things Better.** A thorough analysis of governance structures and relevant actors is needed to identify which ones can be leveraged to generate effects in support of COIN objectives. Ideally, the COIN operation will focus on a few high-impact LOEs that have the most promise to weaken the insurgency—those LOEs that address grievances subsumed into the insurgency narrative—rather than pursuing wholesale state-

SECURITY, LAND, AND CONFLICT IN ITURI

Since 1999, the Ituri district in northeastern Democratic Republic of Congo has been the site of an intense ethnic war characterized by extreme brutality against civilians. The Hema and Lendu communities had long-running disputes over land, but the insecurity, external manipulation, and collapse of state authority associated with the Second Congo War led to a major escalation that by 2003 had cost more than 50,000 lives through direct violence. Attacks against civilians by armed actors on all sides were driven by a desire to control illegal mining sites and to settle land disputes by force of arms.

In 2003, in the wake of the Ituri crisis and the temporary intervention of the French-led Interim Emergency Multinational Force, MONUC [United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo] launched a military campaign to compel the various armed groups to enter the demobilization, disarmament, and reintegration (DDR) program. Intense military pressure applied systematically and often in conjunction with the Congolese government military led to over 15,000 combatants entering the DDR process by August 2005 and a significant reduction in the number of attacks on civilians.

However, MONUC and the Congolese government failed to capitalize on the opportunity created through military action. MONUC viewed the ethnic militias as warlord groups and the conflict as fundamentally driven by illegal exploitation of natural resources rather than land disputes. The legitimacy and administrative capacity of the Congolese government in Ituri was limited, and despite efforts by local officials, a key driver of the conflict went unaddressed. As MONUC's main effort shifted to addressing insecurity in the Kivus, analysts and local peace building actors warned that the underlying conflict dynamics had the potential to reemerge and generate new violence as military pressure eased. Thus Ituri serves as an example of the need for integrated military and nonmilitary lines of operation to fully exploit military success and build toward long-term stability.

SOURCE: Adapted from Thierry Vircoulon, "The Ituri paradox: When armed groups have a land policy and peacemakers do not," in Ward Anseeuw and Chris Alden (eds.), *The Struggle over Land in Africa* (Cape Town: Human Sciences Research Council Press, 2010)

building efforts as a default. Such an approach will generally be preferable to a wholesale governance effort based on standardized or Western notions of core governance functions, which would risk exceeding the capacities of the USG and joint force as well as the HN government, and thus be counterproductive to COIN. If support to indigenous governance is either misdirected (such as by imposing Western governance functions that local populations do not want) or falls short of the population's expectations, there is a risk that the USG will be blamed, resulting in the loss of legitimacy for the USG and potentially the HN government. Even when the formal political and legal responsibility for governance lies with the HN government, the population may overestimate USG capabilities and capacities to influence outcomes and attribute any shortcomings to US incompetence or underhandedness.

d. Governance Requires a Cross-Functional Approach. Many governance issues are multifunctional and affected by military and civilian activities during COIN operations. For example, land and water rights have featured prominently in insurgency narratives and COIN, particularly in agrarian societies. Grievances connected to land and water rights require the synchronized application of civilian and military COIN activities to address the major drivers of the insurgency. Similarly, the problem of how to handle detained insurgents typically connects to other aspects of the security and justice/rule of law functions, such as the availability of humane detention centers; the capacity to prosecute individuals in a timely manner under a justice system that is perceived to be legitimate by the local population; and the ability of the population to seek redress for wrongs committed by the government. It is important to remember that governance requires a functional mechanism for the resolution of citizens' disputes with government action. Failure to address this key issue, or deficiencies in this mechanism, is often a driving factor of the insurgency. Counterinsurgents will, therefore, likely be faced with a need to prioritize efforts while also remaining cognizant of the linkages and cross-cutting effects these efforts will have in other areas.

e. Distinguish Governance from Government. While governance may be predominantly provided by a formal central government, this is not always the case, and the two terms are not synonymous. Governance functions may be carried out by a variety of individuals or structures in an operational area with considerable local variation. Depending on conditions in the operational area and the USG strategic objective supported by the COIN operation, the JFC may need to deal with different governance individuals and structures depending on the local context. Formal indigenous governance structures may include central, regional, and local governments. Informal structures are likely to vary considerably between HNs and within them and may be very difficult to understand for outsiders. They could include tribal and clan structures, religious and spiritual leaders, and clubs and associations, as well as criminal or insurgent organizations.

(1) Understand Indigenous Governance Structures. Counterinsurgents need to understand both formal and informal governance structures and their respective roles in an operational area. Efforts to improve representation, security, and welfare functions in line with COIN objectives are more likely to succeed when they work with and through the existing local structures instead of trying to build capacity and institutions based on US or Western models. The overall picture is likely to be a mixed one, with some local

structures potentially impeding the COIN objective and others potentially advancing the COIN objective. For example, corrupt informal governance structures may prey on the local population to an extent that locals consider excessive. Other informal structures may be able to promote COIN objectives if locals consider that they offer a good alternative to the insurgents' efforts to provide governance. Pre-conflict governance structures are often times weak and corrupt, serving as drivers of discontent if not a core grievance for an insurgency. These will need to be reformed as part of the changes in a post-COIN society as it is typically better to modify them than to reinvent them. COIN forces should avoid creating parallel structures and programs that displace local governance structures and render the local structures impotent or obsolete.

(2) **Reconcile Local Expectations with USG Goals.** What is and is not seen as effective and legitimate governance by the population will depend on the local context. A careful analysis is needed to determine what the local population considers appropriate and to what extent a failure to meet these expectations is contributing to the insurgency. The results will have to be reconciled with the USG's strategic objectives being pursued via the COIN operation. If democratic governance is part of the broader USG strategy, COIN focused on locally appropriate governance to undermine the insurgency narrative will have to be reconciled with this more long-term agenda, which may generate challenges in terms of PA, information-related activities, and interagency coordination. Generally, counterinsurgents seek to ensure governance arrangements are inclusive instead of reinforcing societal divisions. The USG, and at times the joint force, may be able to assist by channeling assistance in ways that force cooperation across those divisions while also countering the insurgency narrative.

f. **Unified Action and Unity of Effort.** The joint force may become involved in governance and political reform efforts in a supported or, more likely, supporting capacity. In either case, a variety of potential partners could be involved. Ideally, the efforts of HN partners; USG departments and agencies, especially DOS and USAID; international organizations; and NGOs are well coordinated. At a minimum, the joint force is well aware of who is doing what in the operational area. Joint force activities to support governance and political reform leverage and support existing efforts of interagency and interorganizational partners. Projects and programs at different institutional levels (e.g., ministries, departments, bureaus) and at different levels of governance (national, provincial, tribal) are harmonized to support the COIN objectives. Coordination efforts generally seek to prioritize HN partners and USG departments and agencies

g. **Interagency Challenges.** The objective of unified action may be challenged by interorganizational differences. USG civilian and military participants may encounter differences with respect to national versus local orientation, long-term versus short-term outlook, project selection, and the reliability of local partners. A common understanding of the overall mission cannot be assumed. Even where an overall USG strategy for a particular operational area has been agreed to by all USG departments and agencies involved, individuals are likely to interpret that mission through their particular agency's prism. For example, the commander's LOEs in a COIN operation may not coincide with the political or economic development efforts of civilian agencies. As a result, JFCs should communicate early and often with interagency partners and build workable coordinating

mechanisms. Coordination is best addressed early in the process, ideally during the early phases of planning (mission analysis).

h. The Joint Force as Supported and Supporting Participant in Building Indigenous Governance. The joint force may be in a supporting or supported role in a COIN operation depending on the nature and phase of the operation, as well as the specific location within the operational area.

(1) **Direct Responsibility for Governance.** Historically, the US military has taken on full governing responsibilities in a number of major military operations, including COIN or in anticipation of a possible insurgency. A full-scale occupation will likely entail either a transitional military government or a transitional civilian government. While the scenario of full-scale military government may be unlikely in the future, the joint force may still be required to carry out governance activities on a transitional basis either with an explicit mandate or on an ad hoc basis, as happened in Kosovo, East Timor, Afghanistan, and Iraq. In such cases, the ideal of civilian control over governance functions has to be weighed against the need for immediate action to prevent prolonged periods of anarchy. It may then be appropriate to implement a gradual transition in which the joint force retains the ultimate authority to directly act on dangerous dynamics while most decision making is undertaken by HN actors, USG civilians, or international civilians.

(2) **Direct Support to Indigenous Governance.** In the absence of a US or other international civilian presence, the joint force may be directly supporting indigenous governance activities. This has particularly been true during early phases of COIN operations in post-combat environments when it typically takes longer for a civilian presence to deploy to the operational area.

(3) **Supporting Indigenous Governance in Support of USG and/or Other Civilian Personnel.** The most typical COIN scenario will feature an interagency USG presence and/or other international actors. Even future heavy-footprint operations are likely to include a significant USG civilian presence, as well as other civilian organizations, such as PNs' civilian agencies, international organizations, and NGOs. In such cases, the joint force will be supporting others in building indigenous governance. In a small footprint scenario, the joint force can typically expect civilians to be in the lead on governance activities, coordinated through the country team.

(4) **De Facto Sovereignty.** Particularly in cases where the joint staff footprint is large and/or HN capacities and capabilities are especially low, the JFC may be confronted with a discrepancy between the de jure sovereignty of the HN and the de facto power differential between HN leaders and the USG presence. Past experience has shown that local populations are very perceptive to the reality of such a situation, even when information-related activities and PA activities are directed at emphasizing an HN lead and the HN government's sovereignty.

POLITICAL GOVERNANCE AND STRATEGY IN AFGHANISTAN

There is strong evidence that a positive and sustainable change in many poor and conflict affected societies has historically come about largely through the action of institutions for governance, including security, justice, and other public goods. There is equally strong evidence that significant improvements in governance institutions take more than a decade, and usually more than a generation, to achieve. Where formal, government, or state institutions are absent or weak, informal, non-state, and hybrid (state and non-state) institutions often come into being.

These patterns are evident in Afghanistan. Government institutions have made real progress over the past decade, but much of that progress has been halting, uneven, and not convincingly irreversible. The country's politics and economy are undeniably influenced by a mix of formal, informal, and illicit actors and power brokers. Some contribute to stability; others threaten it. The government does not have a monopoly on governance—and that fact will not change substantially in our lifetimes. Afghanistan is, and always has been, a hybrid political system.

The US and the international community have tended to treat Afghanistan's hybrid system as a problem to be solved, not a resource to be employed. As a consequence, much international activity has taken place along two opposing tracks. On what could be called the governance track, official strategy has required supporting the government, combating corruption, and building state institutions, under the explicit theory that insurgents can be marginalized if development and governance programs can help build a constructive relationship between the Afghan people and their leaders. On the politics track, the reality of power politics has at times required offering payments and contracts to power brokers in exchange for intelligence, passage, or cooperation, under the implicit theory that some of them are indispensable for stabilization because they control much of what happens in their areas of influence.

Both of these tracks have their merits, but they have tended to work at cross-purposes. Those working to improve governance are explicitly trying to build government capacity at the expense of nongovernment power brokers and patronage systems. Those working with power brokers out of necessity are implicitly undermining the effectiveness of the government and some informal systems. In addition, proponents of both tracks have been overambitious compared to the resources available, while the resources available have been excessive compared to what the country can absorb. The excess and mismanagement have limited the effectiveness of aid and distorted the country's politics and economy in counterproductive ways. In the politics track, contracts, payoffs, and military or intelligence partnerships with power brokers have not been coordinated effectively (if at all), and have too often empowered malign actors more than has been needed to get things accomplished on the ground.

The governance and politics tracks need to be moving in the same direction for there to be any hope that the country will not descend into civil violence and economic collapse as international attention and resources fade. Formal, informal, and hybrid actors, institutions, and networks will need to share the burden of governing and will need a modest level of international support to do so. Power brokers will need to be co-opted into this hybrid system with just enough enticements to keep them from becoming spoilers.

SOURCE: Lamb, Robert D. (2012) *Political Governance and Strategy in Afghanistan, A Report of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) Program on Crisis, Conflict, and Cooperation (CSIS: Washington, DC)*

(5) **Governance Partners.** The primary actors in the field of governance will be HN government actors. This includes formal government representatives at the national, regional/provincial, and district/local levels. Among the non-DOD USG departments and agencies, DOS and USAID are the primary organizations, but others include the Department of Justice (DOJ), DOC, Department of the Treasury, and the US Department of Agriculture. Likely international partners will include national civilian agencies and international organizations such as the UN, European Union, African Union, Economic Community of West African States, OECD, and the World Bank. Finally, NGOs and private sector organizations may conduct activities either in support of or related to indigenous governance functions.

2. Sovereignty

Sovereignty is the supreme power of the governing authority over a given autonomous state and typically exercised through governance. An insurgency threatens sovereignty. Sovereign governments exercise their authority by asserting their control of the population and resources of a defined land mass and their declared territorial waters.

For additional discussion regarding sovereignty, refer to Chapter III, “Counterinsurgency.”

3. Encouraging Political Reform

Insurgency is a struggle for political control of a government or region, and the COIN strategy is centered on a political solution. Part of finding a political solution may involve political reform of HN governance institutions and structures. Political reform in support of COIN objectives should be focused on fostering changes that will degrade the insurgents’ ability to build their narrative around perceived political grievances. Such efforts should be based on local populations’ expectations of what acceptable governance should look like.

a. **Promote Local Ownership.** HN buy-in and participation in political reform is vital for successful COIN. However, neither the HN government nor its population is monolithic—some segments of local governance structures and some segments of the local

population may support (or oppose) political reform based on their perceived interests in (or perceived threat from) the reform. The USG and joint force should effectively channel assistance in ways that empower political reformers. Political reform efforts should be based on a careful analysis of existing power dynamics and expected future power dynamics at the end of the COIN operation or campaign. If local power centers—including individuals, PNs, parties, tribes, clans, or families—are likely to resist or circumvent political reform, sustained efforts will be required to co-opt, undermine, or replace such power centers. Capacity-building efforts that fail to account for HN and local political realities and the real power dynamics operating at different levels of governance are unlikely to have the desired impact. Similarly, efforts to obtain HN buy-in have to be aimed at genuine project ownership by the targeted HN government and local governance partners rather than appearing to local populations as mere ribbon-cutting exercises. This includes involving HN partners at the front end of projects, when key political issues are defined and projects to encourage reform on these key issues are conceived and designed. Democratic reform as practiced in Western government systems may not be feasible and/or desirable by HN partners.

b. Local Perceptions of HN Ownership. In cases where the joint force footprint is large and/or HN government capacities and capabilities are low, it may be difficult to overcome local perceptions that the HN government is beholden to and dependent on the security and financial resources of a foreign power. This may make it difficult to obtain true HN ownership in the eyes of the local population. In such cases, the JFC, in conjunction with USG partners, considers ways to enhance local perceptions of true HN ownership. These may include increased control by HN government and local governance structures over budgets, increased control over project and program decisions, and increased use of local contractors and local patronage networks.

c. USG Influence and Leverage. The JFC will require a detailed understanding of the current political landscape in the operational area, taking into account both formal political structures (e.g., HN national, provincial, and local governments and the strength of linkages among them) and informal structures (such as tribes, clans, kinship networks, religious/spiritual authorities, clubs and associations, private sector figures, and criminal and insurgent networks) or a combination of the two governance structures. This analysis will center on what, if any, reforms or changes are required to the political landscape to achieve the COIN objective. It will have to consider who the likely winners and losers will be once political reform takes place, whether the winners are likely to act in accordance with the COIN objective, and whether losers are likely to become insurgents or spoilers. The political strategy should provide political space for the losers of reform, and the USG and joint force may have a critical role in both constraining the winners and reassuring the losers. To fulfill this role effectively, it is important to retain leverage by empowering reformers and structuring assistance in ways that will further the COIN objective.

d. Means. Depending on specific conditions in the operational area, the USG and joint force will be able to employ a number of tools to encourage desired political change.

(1) Financial and Technical Assistance. Financial and technical assistance can be leveraged by making them conditional on political changes. Projects may be designed

with a view to supporting change by including and excluding particular stakeholders. USG resources can be channeled to constructive partners within the HN government and local partners.

(2) **SA and Partnering.** Direct SA may be channeled to selectively support HNSF that are constructive COIN partners both politically and militarily. Mentoring and partnering activities provide further opportunities to steer HN partners toward constructive change.

(3) **Institution Building.** Decisions on who to empower in the process will be guided by COIN objectives. The USG and joint force will have to choose carefully which institutions should be strengthened. The same applies to parts of institutions. The insurgency narrative may attack institutional weaknesses as CVs of the counterinsurgents. This could include lack of representation or responsiveness, corruption, and a lack of transparency. Political reform efforts will need to be prioritized for maximum impact on those CVs.

(4) **Motivation.** HN governance actors can undermine COIN if they fail to deliver governance functions in line with popular expectations. Publicizing abusive behavior can in itself lead to changes. USG and joint force personnel should judge carefully whether HN shortcomings are the result of a lack of capacity and capability or the result of abuse. If it is a lack of HN capacity, commanders should seek to help HN partners improve in critical areas. Where HN shortcomings result from deliberate abuses, providing information to the media can be an effective tool to incentivize individuals to modify their behavior.

4. Building Effective Governance

HN Structures Should Be Seen to Be Delivering Effective Governance. Whenever possible, support to indigenous governance should be channeled by, with, and through HN personnel and structures. This requires political will to do so on the part of the HN government. In addition, it may be particularly challenging to alter perceptions of the HN government if the local population perceives the HN government as not being truly sovereign. Effective governance will be defined in terms of HN standards and expectations—the prevailing social contract between the population and its governance structures, and the governance actors within that structure, is what matters. A social contract is an unwritten but widely accepted understanding between HN government structures and the local population as to what services and rules are considered acceptable by the local population. Governance participants include more than just government agencies within the governance structure, but also others involved in informal governance mechanisms. The focus of USG and joint force support will be on generating political effects in support of the COIN objective.

a. **Determining Requirements.** The social contract between the population and governance organizations determines governance requirements. The JFC needs to understand what the local population considers to be predictable and acceptable living conditions to determine what local governance organizations and structures might be

considered legitimate by the people. Both the terms of the social contract and the mechanisms by which the HN delivers may vary across the operational area.

b. Make-Up of Local Governance Structures. Joint forces have to understand who should participate in governance across the operational area. Various individuals and groups are likely to claim a right to participate formally or informally. The list might include ethnic groups, tribes, clans, particular families, religious leaders, political parties, and key individuals. COIN objectives will determine whether changes are required in such local arrangements. Experience has shown that the precise local political arrangement can vary considerably across an operational area. It will therefore often be necessary to reconcile locally targeted bottom-up approaches with centralized or top-down efforts at the national level.

c. Governance Processes and Procedures. A key challenge for counterinsurgents is how to leverage existing governance processes and procedures to weaken the insurgent. This requires a detailed understanding of what the current decision-making models are. Formal and informal governance structures are likely to feature different decision-making models. Similarly, national-level models may differ from regional or local mechanisms. The core issue is how decisions are actually made and what, if any, parts of the process are contested by the insurgency.

(1) Political Participation. Counterinsurgents should understand the relationship between the mechanisms for political participation and the insurgency in the HN. Exclusion from political participation is often part of the insurgency narrative. In such cases, counterinsurgents should explore ways to encourage political participation or co-opt insurgents into HN political processes. These processes may include formal structures like political parties and government ministries. A chance to compete in national and/or local elections can offer an avenue for insurgents to move away from violence and into regular politics. However, elections can also become an occasion for violent contestation, especially if insurgents and other spoilers are able to operate with relative ease and counterinsurgent security forces are unable to provide effective public security. In such an environment, elections may actually embolden insurgents to keep fighting rather than turning to peaceful politics. In addition to formal structures, informal arrangements such as patronage networks will often provide opportunities for alternative approaches. Patronage describes the distribution of government jobs or other favors to political allies. Patrons at different levels of formal and informal governance structures will dispense largesse, resources, and/or protection to groups of clients in return for their loyalty. Depending on the power of the patron at the center of the network, clients may in turn extend patronage to other clients at lower levels (e.g., from national, to provincial, to local levels). Counterinsurgents should consider carefully if and how such informal structures can be altered to generate effects in support of COIN objectives.

COMPLEXITY IN BUILDING GOVERNANCE IN SPIN BOLDAK, AFGHANISTAN

The greatest impediment to formal governance in Spin Boldak was the singular lack of concern among authorities either at the provincial or national level when it came to the district's affairs. Despite the importance of Spin Boldak to the future of Afghanistan in terms of revenue generated through customs receipts at the border (i.e., the coalition's exit strategy), real decision-making authority in the district resided with the Afghan border police commander Gen. Razziq, rather than appointed civilian officials.

In Spin Boldak, the combination of poor governance and perceived tribal preference fed an insurgent narrative that undermined all other efforts undertaken and bankrolled by the international community, driving a wedge between the government the coalition was backing and the people they were meant to serve, placing the coalition on the wrong side of the equation.

In response to the discrimination faced by Spin Boldak's substantial internally displaced person (IDP) population, which included disparate groups lacking any representation on either the District Tribal Shura or the District Development Assembly (DDA), the district support team (DST) in late 2009 determined it best not to deal officially with the Shura/DDA, until it would accept IDP membership. To do otherwise would have sanctioned the disenfranchisement of 1/3 of the population.

The heads of the Shura and DDA were adamantly opposed to cooperation (read: sharing) with groups having in their eyes no legal claims to land or rights in Spin Boldak. Their job as they saw it was to protect local interests, including their own, against all outside threats, including from fellow Afghans. Over time, however, more and more Shura members sought to participate in the advisory committee (known locally as the commission) as this was where the DST came to consult district leadership, not the Shura/DDA. In the process, local Achekzai and Noorzai elders became at least acclimatized to sitting alongside IDP and Kuchi representatives; full acceptance would take much longer. Despite the election of a Noorzai shura head in late 2010, the sense of Noorzai second class citizenship was grist for the insurgent propaganda mill, permitting the government's enemies freedom of movement through tribal areas, whether through apathy, outright support, or intimidation. In Spin Boldak, insurgent activity had been heaviest in areas furthest from the district center where the reach of government and basic services was weakest. It is perhaps no coincidence that these were primarily Noorzai regions. For Gen. Razziq and perhaps coalition military planners at Kandahar Airfield, these outlying communities were not a priority. Complicating this picture is not only the tension between the two dominant tribes but also fissures within each as individual leaders and subtribes have over the years were forced to make their own accommodation with prevailing political forces out of a sense of preservation, in many instances setting kinsmen against each other.

In many respects, the DST was operating, through the guise of the district governor, as a poor substitute for Kabul leadership. This was not a consequence of a lack of indigenous capacity as much as it was the result of a conscious decision by Afghan power brokers (and coalition leaderships) to accept the status quo in Spin Boldak, including the dominant role played by Gen. Razziq. One risk was that the military/DST began to assume more and more responsibility for addressing local affairs and needs. This was a problem faced by the coalition across the country. While building local capacity was a coalition objective, so was getting the job done. For many military commanders, drawing up a CERP [Commanders' Emergency Response Program] package or employing base assets was sometimes the quicker means to an end. This would have been better left in Afghan hands. Without Afghan authorities taking responsibility, however, sometimes this was unavoidable, particularly when dealing with grievances that feed the insurgency. The end result, though, was a coalition fix, not an Afghan one, leaving the real sources of grievance unresolved.

SOURCE: Case Study: Spin Boldak DST, USAID (2010)

(2) **Decision-Making Procedures.** In addition to political representation, specific decision-making procedures may feature as grievances in the insurgency narrative. Counterinsurgents should understand which key stakeholders are empowered and which ones are excluded by decision-making procedures in both formal and informal governance structures. Adjustments at one or more levels may inform different LOEs in support of COIN objectives.

(3) **Responding to the Needs of Citizens.** Unresponsive governance structures are often part of an insurgency's motives. Even if political representation per se and adjustments to decision-making procedures are difficult to implement, minor adjustments in terms of responsiveness may be able to undermine an insurgency narrative. Efforts aimed at increasing responsiveness should start with the local population's expectations of what constitutes sufficient responsiveness and by which formal or informal institutions.

5. Security Sector Reform

SSR is a set of policies, programs, plans, and activities undertaken by the HN government designed to strengthen the capabilities, capacity, and effectiveness of the HN security apparatus to provide safety, security, and justice, which in turn improves the capabilities of the security forces to secure and protect the population from insurgent/terrorist violence. The DOD role in SSR is supporting the reform, restructuring, or reestablishment of the armed forces and the defense sector. If other USG agencies lack the capacity, DOD may also be tasked to improve the security provided by local and national law enforcement organizations. SSR can be a step toward improved legitimacy. If the population feels more secure, and deems that the government is operating with transparency, accountability and responsiveness to the needs of the population, the relative perception of legitimacy will increase.

For a more detailed discussion about SSR, see JP 3-07, Stability.

6. Criminal Justice System Reform

Effective and acceptable delivery of justice is an essential governance function; it allows for nonviolent dispute resolution. The HN justice system encompasses an array of formal and informal institutions, groups, and individuals. These institutions can include the ministry of justice, law enforcement personnel, law schools and bar associations, and legal advocacy organizations. The groups and individuals can include members of the judiciary, legislature, corrections, and prosecutor's office; public defenders; ombudsmen; regulatory bodies; and human rights and public interest groups. The legal framework includes the constitution, laws, rules, and regulations. Peace agreements may also constitute part of the legal framework in post-conflict countries. Justice systems differ significantly across national boundaries; there may also be multiple justice systems functioning in a country. To enhance HN legitimacy, justice reform should build upon the existing legal frameworks in the HN. This may include common law, civil law, criminal codes, traditional or religious law, and international law. Foreign SSR planners should avoid imposing their concepts of law, justice, and security on the HN, except where reform is required to meet customary international law with regard to human rights. Implementing such reform, even where warranted, will doubtless entail a sophisticated political analysis on whether to undertake the change. The HN's systems and values are central to its development of justice system reform.

For more discussion on justice sector reform, see JP 3-07, Stability.

GOVERNANCE AND PUBLIC SERVICES IN COUNTERINSURGENCY: HEARTS AND MINDS OR HARD POLITICS?

An oversimplified version of the concept of hearts and minds drove a large portion of the budget in Iraq and Afghanistan. It was based on an assumption that delivering a variety of public services would win a population over to the side of the counterinsurgents. Evidence suggests, at best, such programs are ineffective and, at worst, contribute to instability or are diverted to fund the insurgencies.

Another approach has been to run mass employment programs to keep insurgents from hiring the under-employed to emplace improvised explosive devices, provide intelligence, or perform other related tasks. To date, studies have actually found that higher unemployment is usually correlated with more violence.

A third suite of approaches is more nuanced and is based on appealing to interests rather than sentiment. In this account, the provision of basic services and programs to jump-start the local economy are intended to appeal to the population's calculations about their medium- to long-term interests even as the military applies combat power to secure them against insurgents in the short term.

In all these cases, counterinsurgents were responding in part to an assumption that the grievances associated with passive or active support for the insurgency are material. In some cases, they were also responding to the complaints and demands explicitly articulated by the population.

When the phrase “Hearts and Mind” became vogue in counterinsurgency (COIN) lexicon during the Malayan emergency, Field Marshall Gerald Templer did not intend for the term to represent appealing literally to the hearts of the population, but rather to emphasize the importance of the nonlethal aspects of COIN. In 1968, Field Marshall Templer was quoted as saying “that nauseating phrase I think I invented” in reaction to the overuse and misunderstanding regarding the actual intent and meaning to the term. In reality, it was the combination of severe coercive measures used in conjunction with other nonlethal activities that led to the British victory in Malaya.

Assessing the evidence across entire theaters or conflicts is difficult. A wide study of development projects in Iraq found that small-scale projects funded through Commander’s Emergency Response Program seemed to be effective at reducing violence. On the other hand, a study on programming in Helmand described that in the eyes of the population, the distribution of aid was seen as reflecting the post-2001 tribal carve-up of institutions, power, and resources, and access to development funding was seen as an avenue for consolidating wealth and political power. Evidence from focus groups suggested that “development” was viewed by individuals from non-beneficiary communities as evidence of elite capture of aid processes rather than a demonstration that aid was a public good that could be extended to all. Without adequate analysis of social fault lines, the distribution of aid in such a fragmented and polarized polity often marginalized groups and increased the sense of alienation rather than giving hope of potential change. These challenges appear to have been compounded by inevitable weaknesses in oversight and program management structures within the provincial reconstruction team.

This illustrates the difficulty in disentangling whether the problems observed in recent operations are due to planning or execution. A recurrent problem for both planning and execution is related to scale. First, governance and development programs are often structured around development objectives such as improved health outcomes or increased incomes, rather than political objectives such as rewarding participation in local governance systems.

As a result, they are often structured and implemented in ways that don’t adequately take into account the varied local political dynamics of different regions in a counterinsurgency environment.

Second, the pursuit of broad development objectives often naturally leads to large-scale projects whose very size makes them more difficult to carefully monitor. These two factors make development projects more vulnerable to corruption and distortion. Development projects that are

distorted by the dynamics of the conflict can exacerbate grievances and discredit counterinsurgents by raising and then disappointing expectations when promises aren't met, and by reproducing the patterns of political exclusion that undermined the legitimacy of the host-nation government in the first place.

As explained by the Special Inspector General for Iraq, war, politics, and reconstruction are linked in ways individuals within the government failed to appreciate in the opening years of the Iraq conflict. If war, as Clausewitz said, is an extension of politics by other means, so too is relief and reconstruction an extension of political, economic, and military strategy. In this regard, there is a distinct difference between pursuing reconstruction to catalyze long-term economic growth and deploying reconstruction to support a counterinsurgency campaign.

Four consistent lessons emerge from the literature:

1. Security is the top consideration for the population, but that includes long-term security as well as short-term. Groups that feel their long-term survival will be threatened under the host-nation government are unlikely to cooperate with counterinsurgents. This means that the US should pay as much attention to the threat from predatory government forces as the insurgents, even if it addresses those threats through different means.

2. After security, the representation of marginalized groups in formal and informal governance bodies is the most important element to get right. Service delivery should flow from that representation and be used as a reward for participation. However, participation will often only be possible with credible guarantees of security.

3. On the other hand, representation is not enough to maintain legitimacy and generate cooperation among the population. It has to produce tangible benefits in terms of services and programs in order to make it meaningful. Governance systems should be relevant (in terms of addressing the most urgent problems of the population), reliable (in terms of consistency over time), and effective (in terms of delivering results).

4. Enhancing government services and kick-starting economic development is best accomplished through a limited number of small-scale and highly localized projects that are carefully monitored by counterinsurgent forces to prevent corruption or diversion, exploit existing formal and informal governance mechanisms wherever possible, and are specifically designed to reinforce a narrative of inclusive politics and reconciliation rather than elite capture and zero-sum competition.

Various Sources

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX B AUTHORITIES IN COUNTERINSURGENCY OPERATIONS

1. Overview

a. Law and policy govern the actions of US forces in all military operations, including COIN. A legal basis must exist for US forces to conduct operations. This legal basis influences many aspects of a COIN operation, specifically ROE, how US forces organize and train foreign forces, the authority to spend funds to benefit the HN, and the authority of US forces to detain and interrogate. As Commander in Chief, the President issues orders through the Secretary of Defense to a CCDR for a COIN operation. This appendix summarizes some of the laws and policies that bear upon COIN operations. No summary provided here can replace a consultation with the unit's supporting staff judge advocate.

b. **Leadership in Support of HN COIN.** Whenever possible, civilian agencies should lead COIN, especially when the mission is for US support to HN COIN. However, the changing nature of COIN means that lead responsibility often shifts among military, civilian, and HN authorities, and these transitions should be planned and managed at the highest levels. Military participation in COIN is focused on establishing security, assisting in SSR, and supporting other stability tasks as required. Although JFCs should be prepared to lead COIN if required, the JFC should normally focus military operations in support of a comprehensive effort led by the COM. Military forces should also be prepared to work in informal or formal integrated civil-military teams that could include, and in some cases be led by, civilian agencies, foreign governments, international organizations, NGOs, and members of the private sector with relevant skills and expertise.

2. Title 10, United States Code, Authority

Military Leadership in Support of COIN. There are cases in which DOD, through Title 10, United States Code (USC), authority, is the lead organization for COIN operations. When COIN is part of a large-scale operation or campaign, and/or when the US does not have an established diplomatic presence in an AOR, the GCC is the lead authority and the JFC should focus military operations as part of the GCC's plan. The President or Secretary of Defense issue the deployment order and execute order. Transition to civilian authority or HN authority occurs at the direction of the President, usually when an HN governing authority and diplomatic presence is established.

3. Rules of Engagement

ROE are directives issued by competent military authority that delineate the circumstances and limitations under which US forces will initiate and/or continue combat engagement with other forces encountered. Often, these directives are specific to the operation. The SROE establish fundamental policies and procedures governing the actions to be taken by US commanders and their forces during all military operations outside US territory except for law enforcement and security functions performed on US facilities. SROE are fundamentally permissive in that a commander may use any lawful weapon or tactic available for mission accomplishment unless specifically restricted. When working

with a multinational force in COIN operations, commanders must coordinate the ROE thoroughly. All ROE must comply with the law of war. ROE in COIN are dynamic. Training counterinsurgents in ROE should be reinforced regularly and should specifically address considerations for the employment of nonlethal weapons.

4. Coordination Measures in Counterinsurgency Operations

a. In a COIN operation where the military and civilian agencies share the same OE, tensions may rise over a number of issues. Various agencies acting to reestablish stability may differ in goals and approaches based on their institutional authorities and culture. While the overall objective is unified action, at times, varying degrees of coordination and communication between the wide degree of actors, and unclear roles, especially as they pertain to the legal authorities agencies leverage, may lead to the substantial incongruence between desired and actual COIN. Complicating matters, the range of operations employed by the military and civilian organizations (FID, SFA, COIN, CT, stability activities, and UW) are tied to an array of legal authorities, each with its own rules that limit where, how, and when a capability can be applied. Understanding the legal authorities each participant can leverage is an integral component to understanding the OE.

b. **Memoranda of Agreement and Memoranda of Understanding.** The relationships and authorities between military and civilian agencies are usually given in the document directing an agency to support the operation. Commanders exercise only the authority those documents allow; however, the terms in those documents may form the basis for establishing some form of relationship between commanders and agency chiefs.

5. Assistance Authorities and Counterinsurgency

DOD is usually not the lead USG department for assisting foreign governments, including the provision of SA—that is, military training, equipment, and defense articles and services—to the HN’s military forces. DOD contribution may be large, but the legal authority is typically one exercised by DOS. DOS delegates some of these authorities to DOD (foreign military sales, foreign military financing, international military education and training leases).

a. **FID.** US forces have limited authority to provide assistance to foreign governments. Without receiving a deployment or execute order, US forces may be authorized to make only limited contributions in support of HN COIN. If the Secretary of State requests, and the Secretary of Defense approves, US forces can participate in this action. The request and approval go through standing statutory authorities in Title 22, USC. Title 22, USC, contains the Foreign Assistance Act, the Arms Export Control Act, and other laws which authorize SA, developmental assistance, and other forms of bilateral aid. The request and approval might also occur under various provisions in Title 10, USC. Title 10, USC, authorizes certain types of military-to-military contacts, exchanges, exercises, and limited forms of humanitarian and civic assistance in coordination with the COM for the HN. In such situations, US military personnel work as administrative and technical personnel. They are part of the US diplomatic mission, pursuant to a status-of-forces agreement or pursuant to an exchange of letters. This cooperation and assistance is

limited to liaison, contacts, training, equipping, and providing defense articles and services. It does not include direct involvement in operations.

b. **SFA.** DOD is usually not the lead governmental department for assisting foreign governments, even for the provision of SFA—that is, military training, equipment, and defense articles and services—to the HN’s military forces. DOD contribution may be large, but the legal authority is typically one exercised by DOS. With regard to provision of training to a foreign government’s police or other civil interior forces, the US military typically has no authorized role. The Foreign Assistance Act specifically prohibits assistance to foreign police forces except within carefully circumscribed exceptions, and under a Presidential directive, and the lead role in providing police assistance within those exceptions has been normally delegated to DOS’s Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs. However, the President did sign a decision directive in 2004 granting authority to train and equip Iraqi police to the Commander, US Central Command. Similarly, the President signed a decision directive in 2009 granting authority to US Central Command to support the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Training Mission—Afghanistan.

c. Training and equipping of foreign security forces should be specifically authorized. Usually, DOD involvement is limited to a precise level of man-hours and materiel requested from DOS under the Foreign Assistance Act. The President may authorize deployed US forces to train or advise HNSF as part of the operational mission. In this case, DOD personnel, operations, and maintenance appropriations provide an incidental benefit to those security forces. All other weapons, training, equipment, logistic support, supplies, and services provided to foreign forces should be paid for with funds appropriated by Congress for that purpose. Examples include the Iraq Security Forces Fund and the Afghan Security Forces Fund of fiscal year 2005. Moreover, the President should give specific authority to DOD for its role in such train and equip efforts. There are instances when the President signs a decision directive that gives the commander, under policy guidance from the COM, the authorization to organize, train, and equip HN forces, including police as discussed above. Absent such a directive, DOD lacks authority to take the lead in assisting an HN to train and equip its security forces.

For more information, see JP 3-22, Foreign Internal Defense.

6. Legal Authorities During Counterinsurgency

a. While the JFC should not assume that all COIN operations involve a counterdrug component, many cases around the globe have proven a nexus exists between insurgents and illicit narcotics trafficking. Therefore, based on the determination of the OE, use of specific DOD counterdrug authorities may be required in coordination with COIN activities.

b. The statutes listed in the annual national defense authorization act identify the purposes for which DOD may expend funds appropriated for DOD drug interdiction and counterdrug activities. Each use of these authorities or funds requires a determination, based on the facts specific to that proposed use, that the funds will be expended for the

purpose of counterdrug activities. These activities include measures taken to detect, interdict, disrupt, or curtail any activity reasonably related to drug trafficking. Once the determination is made, the activity may proceed, assuming the activity complies with other applicable authorities.

(1) Under Title 10, USC, Section 124, DOD is the single lead agency for the USG for the detection and monitoring of aerial and maritime transit of illicit drugs into the US. Under this section, DOD personnel may be authorized to operate DOD equipment to intercept a vessel or an aircraft detected outside the land area of the US.

(2) Title 10, USC, Sections 271 and 284, allows the Services to conduct a number of activities for law enforcement agencies (LEAs) so long as they do not adversely impact the military preparedness of the US. However, the authorities to effect an arrest are highly circumscribed. Consultation with the legal advisor or staff judge advocate is recommended.

For more information on DOD's role in counterdrug activities and law enforcement, see JP 3-07.4, Counterdrug Operations, and DODI 3025.21, Defense Support of Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies.

c. Under Title 22, USC, Section 2304, except under certain circumstances, no SA may be provided to any country the government of which engages in a consistent pattern of gross violations of internationally recognized human rights. Before US military conduct theater contracting in the HN, the associated foreign personnel must be vetted for any previously identified human rights abuses.

d. Per Title 10, USC, Section 2302, US law prohibits providing funds to the enemy. COIN forces must know who they are conducting theater contracting with, both directly and indirectly, to ensure due diligence in compliance.

e. The Foreign Assistance Act and foreign operations appropriations provide legal authorities to the DOS Bureau for International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs to provide counterdrug and anticrime assistance to foreign partners. Many of these assistance programs are implemented in cooperation with the US LEAs or other partners, such as courts or bar associations.

f. **Transfer of Detainees to the HN.** There are certain conditions under which US forces may not transfer the custody of detainees to the HN or any other foreign government; consult the staff judge advocate for legal review. US forces retain custody if they have substantial grounds to believe the detainees would be in danger in the custody of others. Such danger could include being subjected to torture or inhumane treatment by the HN or any other foreign government.

For more information on transferring detainees, see JP 3-63, Detainee Operations, and DODD 2310.01E, DOD Detainee Program, and consult with the legal advisor or staff judge advocate.

g. **DOD Civilian Personnel and Contractors.** Modern COIN operations involve many DOD civilians, as well as civilian personnel employed by government contractors. Personnel accountability procedures need to be addressed for DOD civilian personnel and contractors as part of COIN operations. These civilians may be made subject to general orders. They are also subject to US laws and to the laws of the HN. Civilians may be prosecuted or subjected to adverse administrative action. Determining criminal jurisdiction over civilians involves an analysis of many factors including status the civilian has (e.g., contractor personnel, DOD civilian, HN civilian) as well as agreements with the HN (e.g., status-of-forces agreements, exchange of notes, or memoranda of understanding). Under certain limited circumstances, Uniform Code of Military Justice authority may be exercised over DOD civilians, contractors authorized to accompany the force, and other persons serving with or accompanying armed forces during declared war or contingency operations, or DOJ may prosecute civilians under the Military Extraterritorial Jurisdiction Act. The daily oversight and supervision of contract personnel is governed by the contract, and the contracting officer oversees contract performance. DOD directives contain further policy and guidance pertaining to US civilians and contractors accompanying forces conducting COIN operations.

For more information on civilian personnel accompanying US forces, see JP 1-0, Joint Personnel Support, and Secretary of Defense Memorandum of March 10, 2008, UCMJ Jurisdiction Over DOD Civilian Employees, DOD Contractor Personnel, and Other Persons Serving With or Accompanying the Armed Forces Overseas During Declared War and in Contingency Operations.

For more information on contractors authorized to accompany the force, refer to JP 4-10, Operational Contract Support, and DODI 3020.41, Operational Contract Support (OCS), and consult the staff judge advocate.

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX C COUNTERINSURGENCY PRACTICES

1. Overview

a. In 2003, the RAND Corporation, on behalf of the USG, completed a detailed study of 71 insurgencies begun and completed between 1941 and 2010. Quantitative data on nearly 300 factors, combined with qualitative data derived the following practices, both good and bad, that the JFC should take into account when planning for COIN. They complement the operational tenets mentioned in Chapter III, “Counterinsurgency,” and can be tailored to accommodate unique COIN circumstances as general guidelines.

b. Clausewitz’s observations on the role of chance in war, to include COIN, is analogous to trying to live a long life. You can zealously follow every healthy practice to increase your chances for living longer, but you could still die young. On the other hand, another person may minimize their life expectancy by following every unhealthy habit, but live to be a hundred. This analogy aptly describes fighting COIN: doing everything right increases the probability of success, but loss is still possible. For COIN, as with health, every good habit “definitely might” work.

2. Successful

The following list provides a number of successful COIN practices:

- a. The COIN force realizes CCS factors.
- b. The COIN force reduces tangible support to the insurgents.
- c. The HN government realizes the importance of legitimacy.
- d. Government corruption was reduced/ good governance increased since the onset of the conflict.
- e. The COIN force realized the importance of intelligence.
- f. The COIN force was sufficient strength to force the insurgents to fight as guerrillas.
- g. Unity of effort/unity of command was maintained.
- h. The COIN force avoided excessive collateral damage, disproportionate use of force, or other illegitimate applications of force.
- i. The COIN force sought to establish positive relations with the population in the area of conflict.
- j. Short-term investments, improvements in infrastructure or development, or property reform occurred in the area of conflict controlled or claimed by the COIN force.

k. The majority of the population in the area of conflict supported or favored the COIN force.

l. The COIN force established and then expanded secure areas.

m. Government/COIN reconstruction/development sought/achieved improvements that were substantially above the historical baseline.

n. The COIN force provided or ensured the provision of basic services in areas that it controlled or claimed control.

o. The perception of security was created or maintained among the population in areas that the COIN force claimed to control.

3. Unsuccessful

The following list provides practices that have proven to be unsuccessful in COIN operations:

a. The COIN force used both collective punishment and escalating repression.

b. There was corrupt and arbitrary self-serving government rule.

c. HN elites had perverse incentives to continue the conflict.

d. The HN was economically dependent on external supporters.

e. An external professional military engaged in fighting on behalf of the insurgents.

f. Fighting was initiated primarily by the insurgents.

g. The COIN force failed to adapt to changes in threat strategy, operations, or tactics.

h. The COIN force used more coercion or intimidation than the insurgents.

i. The insurgent force was individually superior to the COIN force by being either more professional or better motivated.

j. The COIN force or its allies relied on looting for sustainment.

k. The COIN force and government had different goals or levels of commitment.

4. Bridging the Gap Study

a. In the “Bridging the Gap” study, academics use advanced methodological research and analytic skills to provide useful insights to policy makers and practitioners. Since the late 2000s, academics have researched what practices will increase the likelihood of COIN success. Using samples of 171 COIN campaigns, research has identified one categorical imperative, one heuristic, and a number of “rules of thumb” on “how to fight” COIN.

b. Categorical Imperative (“must do”/universal truth). In a 2013 study, researchers identified the traits that are necessary for a COIN force to win. Using this method to analyze 57 COIN operations and campaigns, the researchers found these traits perfectly differentiated wins and losses. Every winning COIN force employed all traits, and none of the losing COIN forces employed all the traits. Separate statistical analysis of this “basket of practices” confirmed the very strong predictive power these traits had on COIN outcomes. To succeed, COIN forces must:

- (1) Demonstrate enduring commitment and motivation.
- (2) Tangibly reduce (external and domestic) support to the insurgents.
- (3) Remain flexible and adaptable.
- (4) Employ at least two of the following three measures.
 - (a) Adopt unity of command for military as well as unity of effort.
 - (b) Maintain the initiative.
 - (c) Maximize intelligence.

c. Heuristic (“should really do”/generally true with certain exceptions). While the 2013 study of 57 COIN operations and campaigns identified unity of command as one of the “two of three” traits that were necessary to succeed, the previously cited statistical analysis demonstrated unity of command, in of itself, also has good predictive strength about COIN success. Empirically, over 85 percent of the 25 cases using unity of command won, or made minimal concessions to the insurgents, while 50 percent of the 32 cases employing unity of effort lost. In other words, employing unity of command almost always succeeds, but relying on unity of effort fails about half the time.

d. Rules of Thumb (soft generalization that is not strictly accurate or reliable in every situation). The majority of “bridging the gap” research identifies numerous good practices (and one bad) that generally, but not always, work but provide no predictive power on COIN outcomes. For the projects completed so far, academically researched COIN practices generally support current doctrine:

- (1) Establish a civil defense force/LDF.
- (2) Conduct more dismounted operations.
- (3) Successfully target (capture or kill) pinnacle/apex insurgent leadership.
- (4) Increase political inclusivity of the HN.
- (5) Do not increase governmental capacity if the HN is not politically inclusive; increasing the capabilities of non-inclusive governments tend to decrease COIN success.

- (6) Increase the overall percentage of indigenous forces.
- (7) Eliminate external support to the insurgency.
- (8) Promote institutions for positive economic growth.
- (9) Convince the population it is not an ethnic and/or religious identity war.

e. Increasing the ratio between COIN forces and civilian population (expressed in terms of “X” COIN forces: 1,000 civilians) does not substantively affect the probability of COIN success. In other words, COIN planners cannot make statistical predictions based on force ratios.

APPENDIX D POINTS OF CONTACT

Joint Staff/J7/Doctrine Division

Web Site: <http://www.jcs.mil/doctrine/>
Email Support: js.pentagon.j7.jedd-support@mail.mil
Phone Number: 1-703-692-7273 (DSN 222)

Joint Staff Doctrine Sponsor/J35

Deputy Directorate for Regional Operations, JOD CENTCOM
Email Support: js.pentagon.j3.list.j35-dd-ro-jod-centcom@mail.mil
Phone Number: 1-703-692-4551 (DSN 224)

US Army Combined Arms Doctrine Directorate

Mailing Address: 300 McPherson Ave, BLDG 472 Fort Leavenworth, KS 66027
Web Site: <http://usacac.army.mil/organizations/mccoe/cadd>
Email Support: usarmy.leavenworth.mccoe.mbx.cadd-org-mailbox@mail.mil
Phone Number: 1-913- 684-2690 (DSN 552)

US Marine Corps Capabilities Development Directorate

Mailing Address: 3300 Russell Road Quantico, VA 22134
Email Support: <http://www.mccdc.marines.mil/Contact-Us/>
Phone Number: 1-703-784-6642

US Marine Corps Small Wars Center and Irregular Warfare

Mailing Address: 3300 Russell Road Quantico, VA 22134
Web Site: <https://marinecorpsconceptsandprograms.com/programs/preparing-tomorrows-fight/small-wars-center-and-irregular-warfare-iw-integration>
Email Support: <https://marinecorpsconceptsandprograms.com/contact-us>

Intentionally Blank

APPENDIX E REFERENCES

The development of JP 3-24 is based upon the following primary references:

1. National

- a. *National Security Strategy*.
- b. *National Defense Strategy*.
- c. *(U) National Military Strategy of the United States 2015*.
- d. *National Military Strategy for Cyberspace Operations*.
- e. Title 10, USC.
- f. Title 22, USC.

2. Department of Defense Publications

- a. DODD 2310.01E, *DOD Detainee Program*.
- b. DODD 2311.01E, *DOD Law of War Program*.
- c. DODD 3000.03E, *DOD Executive Agent for Non-lethal Weapons (NLW), and NLW Policy*.
- d. DODD 3000.07, *Irregular Warfare (IW)*.
- e. DODD 5205.14, *DOD Counter Threat Finance (CTF) Policy*.
- f. DODI 3000.05, *Stability Operations*.
- g. DODI 3020.41, *Operational Contract Support (OCS)*.
- h. DODI 3020.50, *Private Security Contractors (PSCs) Operating in Contingency Operations, Humanitarian or Peace Operations, or Other Military Operations or Exercises*.
- i. DODI 3025.21, *Defense Support of Civilian Law Enforcement Agencies*.
- j. DODI 3200.19, *Non-lethal Weapons (NLW) Human Effects Characterization*.
- k. DODI 8110.01, *Mission Partner Environment (MPE) Information Sharing Capability Implementation for the Department of Defense (DOD)*.

3. Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Publications

- a. CJCSI 3121.01, *(U) Standing Rules of Engagement/Standing Rules for the Use of Force*.
- b. CJCSI 3210.06A, *Irregular Warfare*.
- c. JP 1, *Doctrine for the Armed Forces of the United States*.
- d. JP 2-0, *Joint Intelligence*.
- e. JP 2-01.3, *Joint Intelligence Preparation of the Operational Environment*.
- f. JP 3-0, *Joint Operations*.
- g. JP 3-05, *Special Operations*.
- h. JP 3-07, *Stability*.
- i. JP 3-07.4, *Counterdrug Operations*.
- j. JP 3-08, *Interorganizational Cooperation*.
- k. JP 3-12, *Cyberspace Operations*.
- l. JP 3-13, *Information Operations*.
- m. JP 3-13.2, *Military Information Support Operations*.
- n. JP 3-15.1, *Counter Improvised Explosive Device Activities*.
- o. JP 3-16, *Multinational Operations*.
- p. JP 3-20, *Security Cooperation*.
- q. JP 3-22, *Foreign Internal Defense*.
- r. JP 3-25, *Countering Threat Networks*.
- s. JP 3-26, *Counterterrorism*.
- t. JP 3-30, *Command and Control of Joint Air Operations*.
- u. JP 3-31, *Command and Control for Joint Land Operations*.
- v. JP 3-40, *Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction*.
- w. JP 3-50, *Personnel Recovery*.
- x. JP 3-57, *Civil-Military Operations*.

- y. JP 3-61, *Public Affairs*.
- z. JP 4-0, *Joint Logistics*.
- aa. JP 4-02, *Joint Health Services*.
- bb. JP 4-10, *Operational Contract Support*.
- cc. JP 5-0, *Joint Planning*.

4. Service Publications

- a. AFDA 2-0, *Global Integrated Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Operations*.
- b. AFDA 3-2, *Irregular Warfare*.
- c. AFDA 3-05, *Special Operations*.
- d. AFDA 3-22, *Foreign Internal Defense*.
- e. FM 3-24/MCWP 3-02, *Insurgencies and Countering Insurgencies*.
- f. Marine Corps Doctrinal Publication (MCDP) 1-0, *Marine Corps Operations*.
- g. MCDP 1-2, *Campaigning*.
- h. MCDP 5, *Planning*.
- i. ATP 3-55.3/MCRP 2-10.A.8/NTTP 2-01.3/AFTTP 3-2.88, *Multi-Service Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Optimization*.
- j. ATP 3-07.10/MCRP 3-03D.1/NTTP 3-07.5/AFTTP 3-2.76, *Multi-Service Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Advising Foreign Security Forces*.
- k. ATP 3-22.40 [FM 3-22.40]/Marine Corps Tactical Publication 10-10A [MCWP 3-15.8]/NTTP 3-07.3.2/AFTTP 3-2.45/Coast Guard TTP 3-93.2, *Multi-Service Tactics, Techniques, and Procedures for Nonlethal Weapons*.
- l. ATP 5-0.6, *Network Engagement*.
- m. *Joint Special Operations University SOF Reference Manual*.

5. Department of State Publication

United States Government Interagency Counterinsurgency Initiative, *US Government Counterinsurgency Guide*, January 2009.

6. Central Intelligence Agency Publication

Guide to the Analysis of Insurgency, 2012.

7. Allied Publication

Allied Joint Publication-3.4.4, *Allied Joint Doctrine for Counterinsurgency.*

8. General

a. *Village Stability Operations and Afghan Local Police: Bottom-Up Counterinsurgency* (Headquarters, Combined Joint Special Operations Task Force—Afghanistan).

b. Asprey, Robert B. *War in the Shadows: The Guerrilla in History, Volumes I and II.* William Morrow and Company, 1994.

c. Byman, Daniel. *Understanding Proto-Insurgencies.* Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2007.

d. Cassidy, Robert M. *Counterinsurgency and the Global War on Terror: Military Culture and Irregular Warfare.* Westport: Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., 2006.

e. Celeski, Joseph D. JSOU Report 05-2: *Operationalizing COIN.* Hurlburt Field: Joint Special Operations University, 2005.

f. Collier, Paul, Anke Hoeffler, and Dominic Roehner. “Beyond Greed and Grievance: Feasibility and Civil War,” *Oxford Economic Papers* (2009), Vol. 61, No. 1, pp. 1-27.

g. Counterinsurgency (COIN) Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR); Operations Defense Science Board Task Force on Defense Intelligence, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, February 2011.

h. Connable, Ben. “Military Intelligence Fusion for Complex Operations,” RAND, 2012.

i. Connable, Ben. “Embracing the Fog of War; Assessment and Metrics in Counterinsurgency,” RAND, 2012.

j. Fearon, James, and David D. Laitin. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* (2003). Vol. 97, pp. 75-90.

k. Flynn, MG Michael, Matt Pottinger, and Paul Batchelor. “Fixing Intel: A Blueprint for Making Intelligence Relevant in Afghanistan,” Center for New American Security (January 2010).

l. Flynn, Michael, James Sisco, and David Ellis. “*Left of Bang*”: *The Value of Sociocultural Analysis in Today’s Environment.*

- m. Galula, David. *Counterinsurgency Warfare*. London: Praeger, 1964.
- n. Gordon, Stuart. 2011. *Winning Hearts and Minds? Examining the Relationship Between Aid and Security in Afghanistan's Helmand Province*.
- o. Hammes, Thomas X. "Countering Evolved Insurgent Networks," *Military Review* (July-August 2006), pp. 20-21.
- p. Hoffman, Frank G. *Conflict in the 21st Century: The Rise of Hybrid Wars*. Arlington: Potomac Institute for Policy Studies, 2007.
- q. Howell, Patrick, "Bridging the Gap in Coin: Integrating and Extending Research on the Factors Affecting Coin Outcomes." National Defense University's 2017 Security Studies and Special Operations Forces, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, 2017.
- r. Kilcullen, David. *The Accidental Guerilla* (Oxford: 2009, Oxford University Press).
- s. Kilcullen, David. "Intelligence," in *Understanding COIN, Doctrine, Operations and Challenges*, ed. Thomas Rid and Thomas Keany (New York: Routledge, 2010), p. 161.
- t. Lamb, Robert D. *Microdynamics of Illegitimacy and Complex Urban Violence in Medellin, Colombia*. 2010. PhD Thesis. School of Public Policy, University of Maryland.
- u. Long, Austin. *On Other War—Lessons from Five Decades of RAND Counterinsurgency Research*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2006.
- v. Long, Austin, Stephanie Pezard, Bryce Loidolt, and Todd C. Helmus. *Locals Rule: Historical Lessons for Creating Local Defense Forces for Afghanistan and Beyond*. 2012. RAND.
- w. Metz, Steven *Rethinking Insurgency*. Carlisle: Strategic Studies Institute, 2007.
- x. Myerle, Jerry, Megan Katt, and Jim Gavrilis. *Counterinsurgency on the Ground in Afghanistan: How Different Units Adapted to Local Conditions* (2010), Center for Naval Analyses.
- y. Paul, Christopher. *Pathes to Victory* (2013), pp. xx.
- z. Rosenau, William. *Subversion and Insurgency*. Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2007.
- aa. Smith, General Sir Rupert. 2005. *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*. United Kingdom: Allen Lane.
- bb. Trinquier, Roger. *Modern Warfare: A French View of Counterinsurgency*. New York: Praeger, 1964.
- cc. Zedong, Mao. *On Guerrilla Warfare*. London: Cassell, 1965.

APPENDIX F ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTIONS

1. User Comments

Users in the field are highly encouraged to submit comments on this publication using the Joint Doctrine Feedback Form located at: https://jdeis.js.mil/jdeis/jel/jp_feedback_form.pdf and e-mail it to: js.pentagon.j7.mbx.jedd-support@mail.mil. These comments should address content (accuracy, usefulness, consistency, and organization), writing, and appearance.

2. Authorship

a. The lead agent for this publication is the US Army. The Joint Staff doctrine sponsor for this publication is the Operations Directorate (J-3). The technical review authority for this publication is the US Marine Corps.

b. The following staff, in conjunction with the joint doctrine development community, made a valuable contribution to the revision of this joint publication: lead agent, Mr. William Rogers, US Army; Joint Staff doctrine sponsor, LTC Jayson Morgan, Joint Staff J-3; technical review agent, Mr. Reyes Cole, US Marine Corps; Mr. Mark Brown, Joint Staff J-7, Joint Doctrine Analysis Division; and CDR Brian Watt, Joint Staff J-7, Joint Doctrine Division.

3. Supersession

This publication supersedes JP 3-24, *Counterinsurgency*, 22 November 2013.

4. Change Recommendations

a. To provide recommendations for urgent and/or routine changes to this publication, please complete the Joint Doctrine Feedback Form located at: https://jdeis.js.mil/jdeis/jel/jp_feedback_form.pdf and e-mail it to: js.pentagon.j7.mbx.jedd-support@mail.mil.

b. When a Joint Staff directorate submits a proposal to the CJCS that would change source document information reflected in this publication, that directorate will include a proposed change to this publication as an enclosure to its proposal. The Services and other organizations are requested to notify the Joint Staff J-7 when changes to source documents reflected in this publication are initiated.

5. Lessons Learned

The Joint Lessons Learned Program (JLLP) primary objective is to enhance joint force readiness and effectiveness by contributing to improvements in doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership and education, personnel, facilities, and policy. The Joint Lessons Learned Information System (JLLIS) is the DOD system of record for lessons learned and facilitates the collection, tracking, management, sharing, collaborative

resolution, and dissemination of lessons learned to improve the development and readiness of the joint force. The JLLP integrates with joint doctrine through the joint doctrine development process by providing lessons and lessons learned derived from operations, events, and exercises. As these inputs are incorporated into joint doctrine, they become institutionalized for future use, a major goal of the JLLP. Lessons and lessons learned are routinely sought and incorporated into draft JPs throughout formal staffing of the development process. The JLLIS Website can be found at <https://www.jllis.mil> (NIPRNET) or <http://www.jllis.smil.mil> (SIPRNET).

6. Distribution of Publications

Local reproduction is authorized, and access to unclassified publications is unrestricted. However, access to and reproduction authorization for classified JPs must be IAW DOD Manual 5200.01, Volume 1, *DOD Information Security Program: Overview, Classification, and Declassification*, and DOD Manual 5200.01, Volume 3, *DOD Information Security Program: Protection of Classified Information*.

7. Distribution of Electronic Publications

a. Joint Staff J-7 will not print copies of JPs for distribution. Electronic versions are available on JDEIS Joint Electronic Library Plus (JEL+) at <https://jdeis.js.mil/jdeis/index.jsp> (NIPRNET) and <http://jdeis.js.smil.mil/jdeis/index.jsp> (SIPRNET), and on the JEL at <http://www.jcs.mil/Doctrine/> (NIPRNET).

b. Only approved JPs are releasable outside the combatant commands, Services, and Joint Staff. Defense attachés may request classified JPs by sending written requests to Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA)/IE-3, 200 MacDill Blvd., Joint Base Anacostia-Bolling, Washington, DC 20340-5100.

c. JEL CD-ROM. Upon request of a joint doctrine development community member, the Joint Staff J-7 will produce and deliver one CD-ROM with current JPs. This JEL CD-ROM will be updated not less than semi-annually and when received can be locally reproduced for use within the combatant commands, Services, and combat support agencies.

GLOSSARY

PART I—ABBREVIATIONS, ACRONYMS, AND INITIALISMS

ACC	area coordination center
ACT	advance civilian team
AFDA	Air Force doctrine annex
AFSOF	Air Force special operations forces
AFTTP	Air Force tactics, techniques, and procedures
AOI	area of interest
AOR	area of responsibility
ARSOF	Army special operations forces
ASCOPE	areas, structures, capabilities, organizations, people, and events
AT	antiterrorism
ATP	Army techniques publication
C2	command and control
CA	civil affairs
CAS	close air support
CC	critical capability
CCDR	combatant commander
CCIR	commander's critical information requirement
CCMD	combatant command
CCS	commander's communication synchronization
CJCSI	Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff instruction
CMC	Office of Civilian-Military Cooperation (USAID)
CMCB	civil-military coordination board
CMO	civil-military operations
CMOC	civil-military operations center
COA	course of action
COG	center of gravity
COIN	counterinsurgency
COM	chief of mission
CONOPS	concept of operations
COP	common operational picture
CR	critical requirement
CT	counterterrorism
CTF	counter threat finance
CTN	countering threat networks
CTP	common tactical picture
CV	critical vulnerability
CWMD	countering weapons of mass destruction
DA	direct action
DCHA	Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (USAID)

DCO	defensive cyberspace operations
DDR	disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration
DOC	Department of Commerce
DOD	Department of Defense
DODD	Department of Defense directive
DODI	Department of Defense instruction
DOJ	Department of Justice
DOMEX	document and media exploitation
DOS	Department of State
DST	district support team
EMS	electromagnetic spectrum
ESG	executive steering group
EW	electronic warfare
FACT	field advance civilian team
FHA	foreign humanitarian assistance
FID	foreign internal defense
FLN	Front de Libération Nationale
FM	field manual (Army)
GAT	governmental assistance team
GCC	geographic combatant commander
HA	humanitarian assistance
HN	host nation
HNSF	host-nation security forces
HUMINT	human intelligence
I2	identity intelligence
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDAD	internal defense and development
IDP	internally displaced person
IED	improvised explosive device
IIP	interagency implementation plan
IPB	intelligence preparation of the battlespace
IPI	indigenous populations and institutions
IRA	Provisional Irish Republican Army
ISIR	identify, separate, influence, and renunciation
ISR	intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance
IW	irregular warfare
JCMOTF	joint civil-military operations task force
JFC	joint force commander
JIACG	joint interagency coordination group

JIPOE	joint intelligence preparation of the operational environment
JP	joint publication
JPASE	Joint Public Affairs Support Element (USTRANSCOM)
JPP	joint planning process
JTF	joint task force
LDF	local defense force
LEA	law enforcement agency
LOE	line of effort
LOO	line of operation
M&E	monitoring and evaluation
MARSOF	Marine Corps special operations forces
MCDP	Marine Corps doctrinal publication
MCRP	Marine Corps reference publication
MCWP	Marine Corps warfighting publication
MILDEC	military deception
MISO	military information support operations
MOE	measure of effectiveness
MOP	measure of performance
MSO	maritime security operations
NAVSOF	Navy special operations forces
NGO	nongovernmental organization
NTTP	Navy tactics, techniques, and procedures
OCO	offensive cyberspace operations
OCS	operational contract support
OE	operational environment
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OSINT	open-source intelligence
OTI	Office of Transition Initiatives (USAID)
PA	public affairs
PEO	peace enforcement operations
PMESII	political, military, economic, social, information, and infrastructure
PN	partner nation
PNT	positioning, navigation, and timing
PO	peace operations
PR	personnel recovery
PRC	populace and resources control
PRT	provincial reconstruction team

ROE	rules of engagement
SA	security assistance
SATCOM	satellite communications
SC	security cooperation
SCHBT	shape, clear, hold, build, and transition
SFA	security force assistance
SOF	special operations forces
SR	special reconnaissance
SROE	standing rules of engagement
SSR	security sector reform
TFC	threat finance cell
TFI	threat finance intelligence
TMM	transregional, multi-domain, and multifunctional
TTP	tactics, techniques, and procedures
UGA	ungoverned area
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USC	United States Code
USG	United States Government
USSOCOM	United States Special Operations Command
UW	unconventional warfare
VE	violent extremism
VEO	violent extremist organization
WMD	weapons of mass destruction

PART II—TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

counterguerrilla operations. Activities conducted by security forces against the armed paramilitary wing of an insurgency. (Approved for incorporation into the DOD Dictionary.)

counterinsurgency. Comprehensive civilian and military efforts designed to simultaneously defeat and contain insurgency and address its root causes. Also called **COIN**. (DOD Dictionary. Source: JP 3-24)

governance. The state's ability to serve the citizens through the rules, processes, and behavior by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in a society. (Approved for incorporation into the DOD Dictionary.)


insurgency. The organized use of subversion and violence to seize, nullify, or challenge political control of a region. Insurgency can also refer to the group itself. (DOD Dictionary. Source: JP 3-24)

paramilitary forces. Armed forces or groups distinct from the conventional armed forces of any country, but resembling them in organization, equipment, training, or mission. (Approved for incorporation into the DOD Dictionary.)

subversion. Actions designed to undermine the military, economic, psychological, or political strength or morale of a governing authority. (DOD Dictionary. Source: JP 3-24)

Intentionally Blank

JOINT DOCTRINE PUBLICATIONS HIERARCHY



All joint publications are organized into a comprehensive hierarchy as shown in the chart above. **Joint Publication (JP) 3-24** is in the **Operations** series of joint doctrine publications. The diagram below illustrates an overview of the development process:

