

Cooperation, command, control and leadership: a suggestion for a framework based on a common set of activities

Cooperation, command, control and leadership are different phenomena that yet share some features. One key common feature is the purpose of reaching a desired goal. Here, we will treat command and control as one entity (C2) following the tradition of for example the Swedish and German languages “ledning” and “führung”. Further, we focus on the time-perspective of execution even though we do not exclude the perspectives of before and after execution. We include all organizational levels since the phenomena are active on all levels even though their relative activation can vary between levels. When the meaning of these phenomena are understood in very different or intertwined ways, collaboration and interoperability may be impaired. In the context of defence and security alliances and partnerships, the entities involved need the ability of knowing what to do and getting it done. This ability in turn puts demand on cooperation to create agreements *between* actors/organizations on what to do, and on C2 to produce knowledge about what to do *within* each involved actor or organization. Both cooperation and C2 need leadership in order to get things done – motivating people to act in hazardous and complex situations.

We suggest that even though cooperation, C2 and leadership are in part separate phenomena, the same set of general activities can be applied in order to fulfil the common purpose. These necessary and sufficient activities are: *data-providing, orientation, planning and communication*. We further propose design-logic in order to understand and/or create systems for cooperation, C2 and leadership. Design-logic consists of three levels: purpose, function and form. This hierarchy is useful both for highlighting common features on a functional level of design and yet providing the opportunity to create solutions on a specific and situated level of concrete form. The suggested framework can potentially increase actors/organizations collaboration and interoperability capability when they are involved in defence or security alliances and partnerships.

Table 1. The phenomena of cooperation, C2 and leadership share the same general activities. Each square presents the abstract product (functional level) together with examples of concrete products (level of form). The activities constitute respective overall process and overall process products are presented to the far right.

Process of cooperation, C2 and leadership					Process product
Activities Phenomena	Data providing	Orientation	Planning	Communication	
Cooperation (inter-organizational)	Required information, e.g., a common operational picture	Action oriented understanding, e.g., an <i>agreed</i> course of action/ <i>agreed</i> intent	Coordination of resources in time and space, e.g., a plan	Transmission of messages, e.g., <i>information/reports</i>	Direction and coordination
Command and control (intra-organizational)	Required information, e.g., a common operational picture	Action oriented understanding, e.g., a course of action/commander's intent	Coordination of resources in time and space, e.g., a plan	Transmission of messages, e.g., a mission/order/report	Direction and coordination
Leadership (individual)	Required information, e.g., a <i>needs description</i>	Action oriented understanding, e.g., a <i>dialogue concept</i>	Coordination of resources in time and space, e.g., a plan	Transmission of messages, e.g., a <i>dialogue</i>	<i>Motivation</i>