COMPARISON OF STANDING OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES OF THE ARMY OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC ON LEVEL FORMATION (INDEPENDENT UNIT) DURING COMBAT AND PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

Dipl.Eng. JAROŠ VITĚZSLAV, PhD

University of Defence, Brno, Czech Republic

Abstract

In this article the author compares selected parts of the Standing Operational Procedures of the Formation of the ACR for the Conduction of Combat Operations with Standing Operational Instructions Forces for deployment in the CRO Operations.

He suggests some Precautions for the Rationalization of System Command and Control on the basis of recognized conclusions.
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1. Introduction

All combat arms, combat support, and combat support service units and formations must establish Standing Operational Procedures (SOP) for conducting combat and peacekeeping operations that support their units in all operational contingencies. SOP should be detailed and covered by all aspects of military operations. Common subjects for formation of Standing Operating Procedures are described in Standardization Agreement (STANAG) 2467.

The STANAG 2467 is implemented when the necessary orders or instructions to create the formation of SOP with the common subjects described in this agreement are issued to the forces concerned.

The aim of this agreement is to standardize, for use by NATO forces, the subjects found in formation SOP used by national and multinational forces. Participating nations are recommended to adopt or develop formation SOP to include, as a minimum, the common subjects described in this STANAG.

2. Comparison of Standing Operational Procedures (SOP) and Standing Operational Instructions (SOI)

2.1. Standing Operational Instructions (SOI)

The SOP used by NATO forces should include, as a minimum, information concerning the following subjects.

Content:

a. Commander’s assessment, concept of operations and mission statement.

b. Command and Control:

(1) HQ Organization and Responsibilities – Operational Establishment (OE).

(2) HQ Deployment.

(3) Order of Battle.

(4) Liaison.
(5) Force Deployment.  
(6) Battle Rhythm.  
(7) Certification/In Theatre Training.  
(8) Air Planning Cycle.  
(9) Operational and Contingency Planning.  
(10) EIW action.  
(12) Battle Space Management (including real estate management of CC).  
(13) NBC Management.  
(14) Orders Dissemination.  
(15) Regrouping.  
(16) Notice to Move.  
(17) Combat Effectiveness.  
(18) Battle Space Management.  
(19) Air Space Management.  
(20) Communications and Information Systems.  
(21) Interoperability.  
(22) Legal.  
c. Information Operations.  
d. Intelligence.  
e. Manoeuvre.  
f. Firepower.  
g. Protection.  
h. Administration and Logistics.  
i. Special needs, including peace support operations.

c. Operations:  
(1) Escort Policy.  
(2) Search Policy.  
(3) Meetings.  
(4) Joint Military/Police Operation.  
(5) Reception of a New Unit (Regrouping).  
(6) Riot Control Measures.  
(7) Barricade Policy.  
(8) Out of Bounds Policy.  
(9) Static Guard Duties.  
(10) Tasking of Military Working Dogs.  
(11) Cross Boundary Operations.  
(12) Liaison Policy.  
(13) Provost.  
(14) Observation Post (OP) Clearance.  
d. Standby Operations:  
(1) Incident Reporting Formats.  
(2) Immediate Response Team.  
(3) Tasking of Fire Assets.  
e. Safety of Personnel Travelling.  
g. Engineer.  
h. Civil-Military Operations (CIMIC).  
i. Information Operations.  
j. Air Operations.  
k. NBC.  
l. Continuation Training.  

II. Plans  
a. Intelligence Operations.  
b. Field Security.  
c. Communications and Information Systems.

III. Combat service support  
If we compare a basic content of SOP with a possible content of SOI it is possible to see some differences following especially from those tasks which are fulfilled in the course of crisis situations. It is obvious that the range of tasks fulfilled in the course of crisis situations is significantly broadened by activities realized in relation to political, national, religious and economic situation in the territory of activities.
With respect to prevailing character of contemporary operations carried out by NATO military contingents, the possibility of realization a joint themes of Standard Operational Procedures revision, indicated in STANAG 2467 is often discussed as well as another possibility to broaden these themes by actual and frequently used themes dealing with contemporary crisis response operations.

3. Conclusion
Activities in contemporary military operations within Alliance multinational forces require high level of consonance of all acting units. It is possible to reach it by standardization of all activities, procedures and documents needed within the command and control process at all command levels. Joint themes realization of Standard Operational Procedure is the decisive prerequisite to meet the above mentioned request.
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