

CHAPTER 3

The Military Decision-Making Process and Master Planning Process Relationship to Base Camp Development Planning

3-1. Introduction. This chapter describes both the MDMP and the master planning process. Furthermore, it explains the similarities, differences, and relationships between the two processes and how they support the planner and planning team in analyzing and developing recommendations for each step of the BCDP process. In general terms, both the MDMP and the master planning process facilitate the same goals; both are processes that assist planners in organizing their thoughts by providing a framework that, if followed, will ensure thoroughness, clarity, sound judgment, logic, and professional knowledge to reach decisions. Since the primary customer, the military, uses the MDMP to plan, it is incumbent upon planners to understand this process and how to apply it as a tool to plan missions associated with military operations.

a. BCDP is a process that is typically time-sensitive and mission-driven. While it is progressive and has an established set of steps, it is cyclical in that oftentimes, planners must review the preceding steps to update discoveries and validate recommendations to ensure that the best possible solution is put forward for decision. The process determines and documents the physical layout of properly located and sized, interrelated land areas, facilitates, and utilities to achieve maximum mission effectiveness. It considers all factors including maintainability and expansion capability. To accomplish this task, planners can use the MDMP or the master planning process steps to develop feasible, acceptable, and suitable solutions to each of the steps of the BCDP process.

b. The *military decision-making process* is a planning tool that establishes procedures for analyzing a mission, developing, analyzing, and comparing courses of action against criteria of success and each other, selecting the optimum course of action, and producing a plan or order (FM 5-0). The MDMP applies across the range of military operations and is used by commanders and their staffs to organize their planning activities, to share and ensure a common understanding of the mission and the commander's intent, and to develop effective plans and orders.

c. *Master planning* is a continuous analytical process which involves evaluation of factors affecting the present and future development of an installation (Technical Manual [TM] 5-803-1). While not stated, the steps of the process also have application to the development of base camps since the development of an installation or a base camp shares many of the same goals.

3-2. The Base Camp Development Planning Process and the Military Decision-Making and Master Planning Processes. The BCDP process, in simple terms, is 'master planning' focused on base camps. It is accomplished much like the planning required for any system or decision that requires a coordinated and synchronized set of steps or actions to accomplish a long-term vision and subsequent objective. Master planning facilitates this

planning with a set of steps similar to the MDMP steps. Since the MDMP is the primary planning tool used by the military, it is reasonable that it would be the preferred method for base camp planning. It is important to understand that whether the steps of the MDMP or master planning are used to reach decisions for the steps of the BCDP process, the results will be the same. In a general sense, the steps of the MDMP or the master planning process provide the methodology to collect, organize, and evaluate data that is pertinent to each of the BCDP steps. Figure 3-1 shows the similarities between the steps of the MDMP and master planning.

<u>MDMP Steps</u>		<u>Master Planning Steps</u>
Receipt of Mission	↔	Establish Vision
Mission Analysis	↔	Collect and Analyze Data
Course of Action Development	↔	Develop Goals and Objectives
Course of Action Analysis Course of Action Comparison	↔	Develop/Evaluate Alternatives
Course of Action Approval	↔	Select Preferred Plan

Figure 3-1. MDMP and master planning similarities

a. *Receipt of mission or establish vision.* The BCDP process begins when notification is given to the planning team that a base camp has been proposed or is to be established. Typically, this notification (mission or vision) is received from a Service Component command, a CCDR, or directly from an operational unit. The method of generating the mission to develop a base camp (contingency plan, OPLAN, or OPORD) usually determines the time available and the depth of planning necessary to support that mission. When receiving the mission, the planning team should attempt to collect as much data as possible concerning who, what, when, where, why, and how of the base camp mission. Answering these questions allows the planning team to move to the next step, mission analysis.

b. *Mission analysis or collect and analyze data.* Mission analysis is crucial to planning as both the process and the products assist planners with situational awareness and determining the scope of their mission. Determining the military mission, the number and type of camp occupants, the primary function of the base camp, and the commander's intent will provide the planner a frame of reference to begin base camp development. It is a continuous process of updating and evaluating new or discovered data. Following are some of the tasks that should be accomplished during mission analysis (see Chapter 4 for a more detailed discussion):

- Identify specified and implied tasks, ensuring that the team understands each task's requirements and the purpose for accomplishing each of the tasks so that they are able to identify the essential tasks that must be accomplished to successfully accomplish an individual step of the BCDP process and subsequently, the development of a viable base camp.
- Evaluate the assets available to the planning team. Having the right and sufficient resources (expertise, time, and funding) should be identified and corrected, if necessary, as soon as possible in the process.
- Determine constraints or restrictions placed on the planner in the design and development of the base camp; for example, a commander may dictate that the base camp have a modular design.
- Identify the facts and assumptions associated with the mission. The facts are typically derived from reliable data sources such as orders or directives and/or information confirmed by the appropriate customer. Other information relevant to the situation, but not confirmed, should be listed as an assumption.
- Assess the risk associated with the mission to both the team and the base camp project. For example, if the team is tasked to select a site, there could be risk to the team if the base camp is to be located in hostile territory. Conversely, if they are not allowed to make an 'on the ground' reconnaissance, they may not make an accurate assessment of the site. Minimize the risk by incorporating all possible geospatial and intelligence information about the projected site.

c. *Course of action development or develop goals and objectives.* The remaining steps of the MDMP or the master planning process are most commonly used to support the BCDP process steps of site selection, land use planning, general site planning, and cleanup and closure. Using the information gained from the mission analysis, the planning team should begin to develop courses of action (COAs). In optimal situations, the team should strive to develop three COAs with the screening criteria of feasible, acceptable, suitable, and distinguishable. During every step of the BCDP process, the planner must continue to request and develop information about the projected site. A description of the screening criteria is as follows:

- Feasible. A COA is considered feasible if it allows the team to accomplish the mission within the available time, space, and resources available.
- Acceptable. A COA is considered acceptable if it justifies the cost in resources.
- Suitable. A COA is considered suitable if it will accomplish the mission and comply with the customer's intent/guidance.
- Distinguishable. A COA is considered to be distinguishable if it differs from the others.

d. *Course of action analysis/comparison or develop/evaluate alternatives.* After the planning team has developed the COAs, they must analyze and compare them to determine which ones provide the 'best solution' for recommendation to the customer/commander. To accomplish this, the team should complete the following steps:

- Review any remaining assumptions to ensure that they are still valid and if or how they will significantly impact or influence a COA. If it is determined that an assumption could invalidate a COA, the assumption should be resolved before further COA analysis.
- Develop evaluation criteria to evaluate the COAs against each other. The evaluation criteria are derived from information gained through mission analysis, technical expertise, experience, and any information that the customer has identified as critical or significant (see Table 3-1). While there is no established number of evaluation criteria selected, the criteria should be limited to a manageable number and provide a degree of differentiation between the COAs.

Table 3-1. Examples of evaluation criteria for site selection, land use planning, and general site planning

Site Selection	Land Use Plan	General Site Plan
Soil Condition	Size	AT/FP Considerations
Probability of Natural Events	Security	Population Proximity
Water Availability	Functional and Operational (Affinity) Relationships	Site Access
Sewage	Utilities/Waste Disposal	Terrain, Slope, Drainage
Power Supply	Environmental Sensitivity	Existing Vegetation
Environmental Conditions	Sewage Treatment/Disposal	Prevailing Winds
Communications Availability	Training Areas	Climatic Orientation
Medical Facility Proximity		Affinity Relationship

- Analyze the advantages and disadvantages of each of the evaluation criteria against each of the COAs. In some cases, the advantages and disadvantages analysis may be subjective; however, a clear positive or negative for each of the evaluation criteria should be demonstrated.
- Weight the evaluation criteria based on the outcome of the subjective analysis and the customer's guidance, and compare the COAs using a decision matrix. The use of either a maximization or minimization chart is acceptable. Table 3-2 provides a simplified example of a decision matrix using weighted evaluation criteria. In this example, the weighting has been designed to reflect the larger numbers (maximization chart) being the better COA.

Table 3-2. Example decision matrix using weighted evaluation criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	COA 1	COA 2	COA 3
AT/FP Considerations	5	1(5)	2(10)	3(15)
Population Proximity	3	2(6)	1(3)	3(9)
Site Access	2	3(6)	1.5(3)	1.5(3)
TOTAL/Weight Total		6(17)	4.5(16)	7.5(27)

e. *Course of action approval or select preferred plan.* As COAs are delineated, it becomes necessary for the planning team to provide the customer with a presentation of options in an effort to obtain a decision. To reach a decision on the recommended COA, the team must prepare a decision briefing. (See Appendix B, Figure B-1, for the decision briefing format.) A decision briefing obtains an answer to a question or a decision on a COA. To facilitate a successful briefing and ultimate decision, the planning team must develop comparison charts, sketches, and other products that will enable the customer to visualize and distinguish among the alternatives. Following the accepted decision briefing format that includes detailed supporting products will ensure that the customer can select and approve a COA even if that individual has not previously participated in the process.

